Shaping ideals of future citizenry in transnational higher education

an analysis of the formation of student subjectivities in a new transnational institutional environment

Li, Jin Hui

Publication date:
2018

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

SHAPING IDEALS OF FUTURE CITIZENRY IN TRANSNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

AN ANALYSIS OF THE FORMATION OF STUDENT SUBJECTIVITIES IN A NEW TRANSNATIONAL INSTITUTIONAL ENVIRONMENT

BY
JIN HUI LI

DISSERTATION SUBMITTED 2018

AALBORG UNIVERSITY
DENMARK

SHAPING IDEALS OF FUTURE CITIZENRY IN TRANSNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

AN ANALYSIS OF THE FORMATION OF STUDENT SUBJECTIVITIES IN A NEW TRANSNATIONAL INSTITUTIONAL ENVIRONMENT

by
Jin Hui Li

AALBORG UNIVERSITY
DENMARK

Dissertation submitted 2018

Dissertation submitted: July, 2018

PhD supervisor: Associate Professor Mette Buchardt
Aalborg University

Assistant PhD supervisor: External lecturer Maja Plum,
University of Copenhagen

Professor Lene Myong
University of Stavanger

Professor MSO Xiangyun Du
Aalborg University (Former)
Qatar University (Current)

PhD committee: Associate Professor Margit Saltofte Nielsen
Aalborg University

Professor Kerstin Von Brömssen,
Högskolan Väst

Deputy Head of Department Martin Bayer,
UCC, University College

PhD Series: Faculty of Humanities, Aalborg University

ISSN (online): 2246-123X
ISBN (online): 978-87-7210-229-0

Published by:
Aalborg University Press
Langagervej 2
DK – 9220 Aalborg Ø
Phone: +45 99407140
aauf@forlag.aau.dk
forlag.aau.dk

Printed in Denmark by Rosendahls, 2018

Content

Part 1

ENGLISH ABSTRACT

The dissertation explores the relation between transnational higher education, nation-state formation and student subjectivities and identities. This relation is addressed through exploring the processes of construction of student subjectivity and of ideals of future citizenry in a new kind of transnational education. In this new kind of transnational education, it is no longer either the program or the students that are mobile, but rather both. The dissertation is theoretically grounded in a Foucauldian framework. It combines different readings and refinements of Foucault's notion of subject, power and knowledge. These combinations are linked with Crenshaw's concept of intersectionality. The bridging of different readings aim at developing a more issue-specific framework to illustrate the specific aspects of subjectivity processes in this kind of education. It means that the bridging of the different theoretical readings is adjusted to the issues that are empirically found in such transnational education. The investigation has two related layers of focus: the concrete microprocesses of the lived education life of students in such an institution and the policy-historical contextualization of the emergence of such institutions. Two main research questions will guide the two layers: *What possibilities for constructing subjectivities and ideals of citizenry appear when students with different national educational experiences meet in a new educational context built on transnational cooperation? And how can we historically understand the emergence of this new education cooperation as part of nation-state building*?

The empirical materials consist of pilot interviews with students at the Sino-Danish University Center (SDC), an ethnographical study at the SDC in Beijing for four months and a policy-historical study that contextualizes the emergence of the SDC. At the SDC the students, faculty and staff (primarily) consist of both Chinese and Danes. The explored aspects of subjectivity and future citizenry are in this dissertation operationalized in the following themes: the changing perceptions of significant national cultural practices in education, the students' reasoning about emotional (re)actions, students' performances of place-identities in a scaled practice (in which a certain scale

materializes for instance the national scale) and the historical emergence of this new education cooperation as part of nation-state building.

The analytical findings show that in the transnational educational spaces, students are required to reflect on and narrate themselves as future citizenry more or less explicitly bound to nation-states. These structures are connected to national imaginaries and the racial hierarchies that are part of processes in the transnational educational context. Thus, this displays that although students might not always explicitly articulate their reflections on their future national citizenry, their bodies are marked through the category of nationality and race. In this way, the nationality and race sensitivity in the transnational education becomes part of (re)building the nation-states as part of 'the West' and 'the East'. These findings are contextualized through the policy-historical analysis, as the politics of national citizenry in the policies are echoed in the spatial power relations in the transnational education space. The politics of national citizenry for China and Denmark are as well built upon the imaginaries of the nation's future and its citizenry, something which seems reliant on 'the global' and 'global-national relationships': The need to have knowledge from abroad becomes essential to the nation-state's survival. In that way, the student who goes abroad (also through transnational cooperation) is acting as a national citizen. It is a citizen that achieves knowledge from and about the other nation-states to serve the nation.

The analytical findings also suggest that the sensitivity to nationality and race in the transnational educational institution is interlocked with gender and age. As such, the possibilities to aspire to a certain scaled place-identity, or to be surfaced with certain emotions, are differently produced for female and male students in the transnational context. These differentiated processes are produced in relation to how age is performed in the future aspirations; how the students' body is inscribed with a gendered age, for instance as having a body with a potential for biological reproduction that is limited by time. Consequently, the dissertation shows that the forms of citizenry fashioned in a transnational educational institution are nationalized and raced/racialized (inflected and articulated with age and gender). In this, the dissertation illustrates that the processes

of subjectivity construction in such a context are played out through different unequal interlockings of power relations. In this way, a microversion of the global power relations and inequalities is processed in the transnational educational spaces.

DANSK ABSTRACT

Afhandlingen undersøger relationen mellem transnational universitets-uddannelse, nationalstatens opbygning (formation) og studerendes subjektivitet og identitet. Denne relation adresseres gennem undersøgelse af, hvordan studentersubjektivitet og idealet for at være fremtidig borger fabrikeres i en ny type transnational uddannelse. I denne nye type transnational uddannelse er det ikke længere enten uddannelse eller de studerende, som er mobile, men snarere begge dele. Afhandlingen er teoretisk funderet i en Foucault-inspireret begreb-sramme. Den teoretiske ramme kombinerer forskellige læsninger og videre-udviklinger af Foucaults begreb om subjekt, magt og viden i kombination med Crenshaws begreb om intersektionalitet. Målet med at forbinde de forskellige læsninger er at udvikle en mere 'issue'-speficik og -sensitiv begrebs-ramme til at belyse de kontekstuelle aspekter af subjektivitetsprocesser i denne type uddannelse. Det betyder, at kombinationerne er tilpasset de tematikker, der empirisk træder frem i sådan en type transnational uddannelse. Undersøgelsen har to relaterede lag: dels de konkrete mikroprocesser af det levede uddannelsesliv blandt studerende i den transnationale uddannelses-institution og dels en policy-historisk kontekstualisering af opkomsten af sådan en type institution. I sammenhæng hermed guider to hovedforskningsspørgsmål undersøgelsens respektive lag, nemlig: *Hvilke muligheder for konstruktion af subjektivitet og idealer om fremtidige borgere opstår, når studerende med forskellige nationale uddannelseserfaringer mødes i en uddannelseskontekst baseret på trans-nationalt samarbejde? Og hvordan kan vi historisk forstå opkomsten af dette nye uddannelsessamarbejde som en del af nationalstatsopbygning?*

Det empiriske materiale for afhandlingen består af pilotinterviews med studerende indskrevet på Sino-Danish University Center (SDC), et etnografisk studie i SDC i Beijing igennem fire måneder og et policy-historisk studie, som kontekstualiserer opkomsten/fremkomsten af SDC. De aspekter af konstruktion af subjektivitet og fremtidige borgere, der er undersøgt i denne afhandling, er operationaliseret gennem følgende

temaer: Den ændrede opfattelse af betyd-ningen af national-kulturelle praksisser i transnational uddannelse; de studeren-des måde at ræsonnere om emotionelle reaktioner og handlinger; de studerendes performance af steds-identiteter som skalerede praksisser (hvorigennem en be-stemt skala bliver til, som f.eks. det nationale) samt den historiske opkomst af den nye form for uddannelsessamarbejde som en del af nationalstatsopbygning.

De analytiske fund viser, at i det transnationale uddannelsesrum skal de studerende i mere eller mindre eksplicit grad reflektere over og relatere sig selv som fremtidige borgere på en måde, der er knyttet til nationalstater. Disse strukturer er bundet til imaginære nationale forestillinger (national imaginaries) i sammenhæng med raciale hierarkier, som præger de processer, der finder sted i den transnationale uddannelseskontekst, der her domineres af nationalstaterne Danmark og Folkerepublikken Kina. Det viser sig således også, at selvom studerende ikke altid eksplicit artikulerer deres refleksioner over deres frem-tidige nationale borgerskab, er mønsteret, at deres kroppe er markeret gennem kategorierne nationalitet og race. I den studerede kontekst bliver den nationalitets- og raciale sensitivitet i transnational uddannelse en del af (gen)-opbygningen af nationalstater på en måde, der er indlejret i kategorier som "Vesten" og "Østen", og som dermed trækker på raciale hierarkier. Disse fund er kontekstualiseret gennem en policy-historisk analyse. Her genfindes den nationalstatsorienterede identitetspolitik for borgerskab i de magtrelationer, som det transnationale uddannelsesrum udgøres af. For såvel Kina som for Danmark bygges national identitetspolitik for borgerskab på forestillinger om nationens fremtid, hvor borgerskabsidealet er koblet til 'det globale' og relationen mellem det globale og det nationale. Det at få viden fra udlandet bliver essentielt for nationalstatens overlevelse. På den måde agerer de studerende, som tager ud i verden (også gennem transnationale uddannelser), som nationale borgere. Det er borgere, som opnår viden fra og om de andre nationale stater for at tjene nationen.

De analytiske fund peger også på, at nationalitets- og racial sensitivitet i den transnationale uddannelsesinstitution er *samproduceret* og *sammenvævet* (interlocking) med køn og alder. Det betyder, at

mulighederne for at aspirere til en specifik skaleret steds-identitet og for at blive indholdsudfyldt med parti-kulære emotioner produceres forskelligt for kvindelige og mandlige studerende i den transnationale uddannelseskontekst. Disse differentierende processer finder sted i relation til, hvordan alder performes i forhold til fremtidsaspirationer; hvordan de studerendes kroppe tilskrives en kønnet alder, f.eks. i form af dét at have en krop med biologisk reproduktiv evne, der er tidsbegrænset. På denne baggrund viser afhandlingen, at mulighederne for konstruktion af subjektivitet i den transnationale uddannelseskontekst er bundet til racialiserede og national-statsrelaterede kategorier, som produceres gennem differentierede og ulige 'interlockings' af magtrelationer. Det transnationale uddannelsesrum ud-spiller på denne vis en mikroudgave af globale magthierarkier, -kampe og ulig-heder.

PROLOG

To set the scene for this dissertation, I will open with an excerpt from my field notebook: my observations from a social event for the new students at the Sino-Danish Center (SDC) from the Danish side. The SDC is jointly run by Chinese and Danish universities. It offers eight Master programs where most of the faculty and the students are either Chinese or Danes. The social event is taking place three days before the official academic program at the SDC starts. I am invited by one of the administrative staff members from the Master program that I will follow. The social gathering is an informal welcoming evening organized by older SDC students at a local pizza and beer place (mostly for foreigners) in the Wudakou area in Beijing. Here, I and a lot of the other students meet each other for the first time.

> It is around 4:30pm in the afternoon. I arrive at the local foreigner pizza place in Wudakou in Beijing. I see that around 40 people are already sitting at the tables and benches with beers and pizza. I sense that the atmosphere at the place is very loose and party-like. I tell a waiter that I am here with the SDC, and she shouts across the room: "Another SDC yeahh" in Danish. A bunch of people from the left part of the bar shout back: "Yeahh" and look in my direction. I smile and nod a bit embarrassed. While walking across the room I hear people speaking Danish with different regional accents which differ from my own flat Copenhagen one. It feels pretty weird considering that we are in Beijing. I find a seat at the end of a table. I introduce myself to the five students who are sitting closest to me. I say that I am a PhD student from Aalborg University and that I will be following a Master program in natural science. They seem to be open and very curious. They introduce themselves as well, by saying which academic background they have, which part of Denmark they come from and their China experiences or lack of the same. I order a beer, and they pass me some pizza slices. While we are eating, we talk about when we arrived and whether we have been in Beijing before and how the students are excited to meet their Chinese fellow students.

> Suddenly, a male student says to me: “I am just so happy to be here in China, and everything has just gone so great so far”, to which I answer: “I am really happy to hear that, but why are you telling me specifically?” Everyone around our table goes quiet for a moment. And then I say: “Relax, I am just teasing you”, and everyone around the table starts to laugh. Then a female student asks me: “No, seriously, do you speak Chinese?”. I answer: “Yes, my Mandarin is pretty okay, and I learned to be fluent in Mandarin last time I was here in Beijing. A few years ago, when I did my exchange here”. People around the table start laughing again, and the female student says loudly: “So, he was not totally wrong” (Field notes, August 29, 2015, Wudaokou, Beijing).

This excerpt points at the very centrality of my dissertation: How certain bodies are assigned a particular nationality, sense of place and belonging and cultural practices in a transnational education context. The excerpt shows that certain bodily appearances become inscribed with a particular nationality, and that nationality is more strongly attracted to the bodily appearance than to the linguistic ability. My bodily appearance, for instance, seems to be stronger than my Copenhagen dialect when interpreted in the transnational education space. It also shows that students expect certain cultural differences and belonging based on different nationality, at the very outset of their encounters with each other across nationalities. These expectations play a vital part in their interaction and interpretation of each other’s actions (including me), as my conversation with the students displays that it is difficult for a person like me to take other (national) positions than the ones my bodily appearance was expected to be linked to, regardless of my linguistic abilities and peculiarities. This dissertation seeks to illuminate such processes: How students become certain subjects in an educational context based on transnational cooperation, where the context is colored by expectation and perception of ‘cultural’ and ‘national’ diversity, intersecting with gender and other social categories. The dissertation explores how such perceptions interplay in the students’ negotiations of identity and subjectivities in their encounters with students with other national educational experiences in a context such as the SDC. Like how and which perceptions and expectations of nationality, sense of place and

cultural differences become ‘obviously’ at stake in the students’ negotiations of subjectivities in transnational education.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Writing this dissertation about the transnational education processes is for me like working on/developing a food recipe. In order for me to do this work, a lot of people have supported me in different parts of the process. However, there is one person who has supported me throughout the whole process: from having a sense of the idea of creating something new (the research idea) to writing the 'the recipe' (the whole dissertation). That is my main supervisor Mette Buchardt. I would like to send a heartfelt thanks to Mette who has followed and pushed the research processes forward from the very beginning. It has been a great learning pleasure (and from time to time somewhat anxiety-provoking) to be under Mette's wings and be pushed beyond my academic comfort zone. Without Mette's tireless critical and sharp comments and suggestions for theoretical, empirical and analytical improvements this dissertation would never have come into being. Thanks to the Master chef Mette for inviting me into the academic kitchen and for believing in the potential of my research idea from the very outset.

Preparing and creating the ingredients would in this research be equivalent to constructing the empirical material. For this, I would like to thank the staff, teachers and students at the SDC: the staff for helping with practicalities in different ways during my fieldwork, and the teachers for letting me observe their classes and for sharing their thoughts on teaching in the interviews. I am especially indebted to the students whom I have followed and interviewed. I will always be grateful for their curiosity in my project, kindness, accommodating attitude to me and the willingness to share their educational experiences. I also wish to thank my writing partner of the comparative policy paper, Jing Chen, for providing the access to Chinese policy documents and qualifying the discussion of the comparative perspective on policy studies.

Practicing and refining the cooking processes in my research corresponds to serving the analytical drafts to selected people for feedback and feedforward. In this aspect, I would like to thank my colleagues in the research groups CfU and SOUL who have been engaged in reading

different drafts and have come up with new perspectives and suggestions. Also important are the people who supported and cheered me on to keep practicing. Those count colleagues from my corridor at the Department of Learning and Philosophy at Campus Copenhagen: Kristian Larsen, Karin Højbjerg, Anette Lykke Hindhede, Vibeke Andersen, Marie Martinussen, Iben Jensen, Stine Willum Adrian, Anders Buch, Mira Skadegård, Jamshid Gholamin, Annette Bilfeldt and Boris Andersen. Thanks also to the following officemates at the PhD office: Lone Falck, Asbjørn Molly, Kenneth Børgesen, Pernille Ahrong, Helle Rønn Smidt for sharing chocolate and the ups and downs in the everyday life of writing a PhD.

Another institution where I have been practicing is at the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Thanks to Prof. Tom Popkewitz for the invitation that made the research stay possible and the fruitful conversations for my research processes. Thanks to people in the Wednesday group for abstract theoretical readings and discussions. Especially, I would like to thank Kai-jung Hsiao, Marcia Ferreira and Johanna Sitomaniemi-San who made my stay in Madison joyful both in and outside the libraries. A special thank you goes to The Danish-American Fulbright Commission for granting me the Fulbright scholarship which made the stay possible.

Rewriting the final recipe is in dissertation work like writing the linking text (“kappen”). First, I would like to thank Lene Skytthe Kaarsberg Schmidt for her critical and valuable comments on the research processes regarding ethnographical fieldwork in an early draft. Second, I would like to thank Christian Ydesen who has acted as a very constructive opponent at the pre-defense. Christian has given me very fruitful comments and proposals for revising the linking text. Third, big grateful thanks to Rolf Mertz for proofreading with such thoroughness and patience.

Furthermore, I would like to thank my co-supervisors Xiangyun Du, Lene Myong and Maja Plum. Thanks to Xiangyun for giving useful advice and tools to structure the research processes/progress. Thanks to Lene for engaging deeply in shaping my analytical sensibility of the empirical material in a racialization perspective. Countless thanks to Maja for her dedication, academic sharpness and analytical sense of detail that have

been so important for the last part of my writing process. The recipe could not have been consistently refined and developed without Maja's help.

To be motivated to keep practicing and adjusting the recipe, I would like to thank my friends and family who have cheered me on during the last couple of years but also demanded some social time with me. This has been very valuable. Without them, my PhD life would have been a tasteless stew. A special thanks to H.C. Haase, my life partner who has been and is my lifeline. Thanks for the ongoing conversation and discussion in and about both the social and academic life. I am grateful for H.C.'s tireless engagement in questioning my ways of thinking and his boundless support for me (also in writing the dissertation). I also greatly appreciate H.C.'s caring – taking more than his share of looking after our daughter Aya, so I could work, work and work on the dissertation.

Lastly, I would like to thank the foundations that have supported me financially: Augustinus Fonden, Oticon, Solar Fonden, Knud Højgaard Fonden, Torben og Alice Frimodts Fond.

PART 1

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

In the second half of the 20th century, many nation-states have promoted studying abroad as a central element of national policy and strategy in the internationalization of higher education (Engberg, Glover, Rumbley, & Altbach, 2014). These policies are often formulated as the needed response to the so-called growing economic globalization. This entails that the students as future citizens of a nation-state should acquire knowledge, global intercultural skills and cosmopolitan citizenry through studying abroad (Brooks & Waters, 2011; Moskal & Schweisfurth, 2018). As part of these policies, new forms of transnational cooperation in higher education have recently emerged. We are witnessing the emergence of jointly run university centers such as Yale-NUS, NYU-Shanghai, Sino-Danish Center, University of Nottingham-Ningbo and Monash Malaysia just to mention a few. These newly transnational constructions of university centers are called education hubs. Here, it is not just the program or the students that are moving for educational purposes, but both (Knight, 2014). Historically, education has been linked to the nation-state and the production of its citizenry as part of a belonging to that space (Popkewitz, 2000). In that sense, these new education hubs form a crossroad for the historical relation between education and nation-state formation. It will thus be interesting to pose questions such as: How do students transform their ideas of and feelings about their future and sense of national citizenry and belonging in such spaces consisting of a mix of teachers and students with different nationalities and national education experiences and with curricula which are not only bound to one nation-state's ideal of citizenry? In this setup here, one might wonder how the making of the differentiated student subjectivities, identities and senses of place and citizenry occurs. Furthermore, how the students' educational possibilities and positions might be shaped by the negotiation and transformation of imaginaries and emotions that tie nationality and other social categorizations to their educational practices and encounters with each other.

In other words, a key aspect of exploring students' subjectivities in this new type of transnational education[1] is to query the occurrence of students' identities and senses of place and citizenry as the fundamental questions. Thus, what has my interest is not whether the politically articulated ideas of knowledge acquisition, global intercultural skills and cosmopolitan citizenry are realized. Rather, I will analyze the relationship between transnational higher education, nation-state building and student subjectivity and identity. This analysis has two related layers of focus, one being the concrete microprocesses of the lived education life of students in such a context, and the other the historical contextualization of these microprocesses. These two layers are structured by the main research questions:

What possibilities for constructing subjectivities and ideals of citizenry appear when students with different national educational experiences meet in a new educational context built on transnational cooperation?

And how can we historically understand the emergence of this new education cooperation as part of nation-state building?

The questions will be explored partly through ethnographical studies at a newly opened university institution, namely the university center Sino-Danish Center for Education and Research (SDC) in Beijing, People's Republic of China, and partly through policy-historical source studies of Danish and Chinese policies of internationalization of higher education and studying abroad. The SDC is jointly run by Chinese and Danish universities. It offers eight Master programs where most of the faculty and the students are either Chinese or Danes. The empirical materials consist of pilot interviews, observations and interviews produced during an ethnographical fieldwork among students. The fieldwork lasted for one semester and took place at the SDC in Beijing. Also, policy documents regarding internationalization of higher education and studying abroad from

[1] Transnational education (TNE) is perceived as the mobility of education programs and providers across countries. This includes the traditional categories of TNE such as twinning programs and international branch campuses, newer categories such as joint/double/multiple degree programs, and a more recent category, namely new universities cofounded by two or more universities from different countries (Knight, 2016). It is the latter form of TNE that this dissertation will explore.

Denmark and China are part of the empirical material. The research methodologies will be described in depth in Chapter 4.

This dissertation takes as its point of departure the bridging of analytical approaches that are based on different receptions of Michel Foucault's notion of subjectivity, power and knowledge (Foucault, 1980, 2002c, 2002a, 2008). Most important is the rethinking of subjectivity and power which I find in Sara Ahmed (2014b) and Judith Butler (1993) and power and knowledge in Thomas Popkewitz (1998, 2007), Maja Plum (2010) and Mette Buchardt (2014). This I combine with more social constructivist readings of the subject-making (such as Lutz, 2011; Staunæs, 2004). In this way, I work with students' subjectivities as becoming processes in which different subject positions are offered to them. The subject positions are on one hand structured by the historical institutional setting. On the other hand, the students have their 'own' way of taking up and negotiating within the positions. Hence, the aim of the dissertation is to elucidate different aspects of transnational education in which students take up the subject positions. These subject positions are structured through the power relations in transnational education. The following questions are interrelated and function as a way to operationalize and to specify elements of the main and general research questions:

- How do the students' perceptions of culture, (professional and scientific) knowledge, citizenry and their own future transform in a context such as the SDC?

- How do the students navigate emotions in these educational spaces (through which hierarchies of intersections of nationality, gender and age are formed)?

- How is place and identity performed by students in their narratives about their imagined future in a global world under transformation, and how does that relate to their everyday lives in transnational education?

- How did cross-national education cooperation historically become national strategies for scientific knowledge enhancement as part of nation-state-building?

PROBLEM DESCRIPTION

In institutions like the SDC, the education of students and thus future citizens is no longer controlled solely by institutions in one nation-state. Hence, we may question how the practiced ideals of citizenry are tied to the nation-state and its state-building efforts. As the curriculum theorist Thomas Popkewitz argues, national schooling is about constructing "the national imaginaries that give cohesion to the idea of the national citizenry… [and] the images of cosmopolitan subjectivities that travel across multiple boundaries that form the worlds of business, politics, and culture" (Popkewitz, 2000, p. 5). This perception makes it possible to explore the schooling processes of these particular transnational institutions, like the SDC, as the relationship between future citizenry, cosmopolitan subjectivities and nation-state building. The analysis of institutions like the SDC can thus display aspects of *what kinds of citizenry* and *cosmopolitan subjectivities* this form of schooling constructs and how this production is related to the identities of the students.

The historical role of higher education in forming the nation-state varies from country to country. For instance, in the two nation-states involved in the SDC, Denmark and China, the role of higher education has in both cases been important in forming the citizenry, although the relationship between higher education and state in the nation-state building process has in many ways differed. In exploring the relationship between nation-state building and the needs for an emergence of higher education in the Nordic countries, including Denmark, scholars have pointed to the vital role of higher education in educating the citizen as welfare expert in the formation and fulfillment of welfare state needs (e.g. Antikainen, 2006; Buchardt, Markkola, & Valtonen, 2013; Telhaug, Mediås, & Aasen, 2006). The scholars investigating the relationship between Chinese universities and the state do not directly attach it to a discussion concerning nation-state building. Instead, the discussion concerns the university as a player in cultural identity shaping (Hayhoe, 1992, 2012), the role of intellectuals participating in education policy-making (Zha, 2012) and the university as an institution contributing to forming civil society and citizenry (J. Li, 2012).

With the historical emergence of institutions such as the SDC, one might ask which (changed) needs in nation-state (re)building are articulated as something that these institutions can fulfill. This might entail a transformation of the ideals of the citizenry that are transferred in higher education. It is the ideals that historically have been fostered in the national university. Hence, with the construction of institutions such as the SDC the spaces of the university in which the citizenry is fostered are under transformation. Thus the educational spaces might be contested even more by the different interests and practices of the different nation-states' strategy of state-building.

This dissertation thus explores these prospective ideals of citizenry and the changing relationship between the individual and the state, and the impact on students' identity construction. The SDC can, on the one hand, be considered a new, emerging space for education where the national ideas of education and citizenry are transformed and disturbed. On the other hand, it can be seen as a space where different types of relations between (welfare) state formation and education are embedded. Thus, examining the construction of subjectivity in institutions such as the SDC provides an opportunity to study socialization that goes beyond types of education programs within the frame of one nation-state.
Thus, this study provides an opportunity to engage with and illuminate the subjectivity processes, and also processes of knowledge production, that occur when different groups of students with different national educational experiences (in the case of the SDC: Chinese and Danish and other EU-ness) encounter a context where the learning environment is based on transnational cooperation. Hence, we can assume that these emerging educational spaces herald new and complex possibilities for creating subjectivity. This includes the students' perceptions of the relation between the nation-state, the individual and learning. In this way, it is a study which goes beyond previous studies of subjectivity conceptualized within the boundaries of the nation-state (incl. Apple, 2010; Dale, 2003; Rizvi & Lingard, 2000; Yan, 2010). This will be discussed further in Paper 1 which provides an overall theoretical framework for this dissertation.

THE STRUCTURE OF THE DISSERTATION – A READING GUIDE

This article-based dissertation is divided into two main parts: the linking text ('Kappe' in Danish) and the section with the papers. The linking text consists of the prolog, an introduction (Chapter 1), state of the art and my contribution to the research field (Chapter 2), reflections on the theoretical framework(s) (Chapter 3) which is an addition to the theoretical framework (Paper 1), the research processes (Chapter 4), discussion of the analytical and methodological findings (Chapter 5), conclusion (Chapter 6) and the epilog. The section of papers consists of five papers: One is the theoretical framework (Paper 1), and the rest are analytical papers (Papers 2-5). I would suggest the following reading sequences instead of reading the dissertation from start to finish. Start with Chapters 1 and 2, then move on to Paper 1 (which is the theoretical framework of this dissertation). After that read Chapters 3 and 4, and then read Papers 2-5 (which are the analytical papers). Now turn back to Chapters 5 and 6 and the epilog.

OVERVIEW OF THE PAPERS INCLUDED IN THE DISSERTATION

Paper 1: Li, J. H. (2018). Beyond the comparative method in the research of education based on transnational cooperation: Leaving the dichotomy between East and West behind. In X. Du, F. Dervin, & H. Liu (Eds.), *Nordic-Chinese Intersections on Education*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Paper 2: Li, J. H. (2018). Transformations of Chinese and Danish students' perceptions of the significance of culture in transnational education in China. In F. Dervin, X. Du, & A. Härkönen (Eds.), *International Students in China: Education, Student Life and Intercultural Encounters*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Paper 3: Li, J. H. (2018). How am I supposed to feel? Female students' emotional reasoning about academic becoming in a transnational

higher educational context. To be submitted to *Gender & Education*.

Paper 4: Li, J. H. (2018). Construction of place-identities and future aspirations for the citizenry in transnational higher education. To be submitted to *Globalisation, Societies and Education*.

Paper 5: Li, J. H., & Chen, J. (2018). What is worth knowing *about and from* 'the others' through studying abroad? A comparative analysis of internationalization of higher education policies as part of nation-state formation in Denmark and China. To be submitted to *Studies in Higher Education*.

PAPER 1: BEYOND THE COMPARATIVE METHOD IN THE RESEARCH OF EDUCATION BASED ON TRANSNATIONAL COOPERATION: LEAVING THE DICHOTOMY BETWEEN EAST AND WEST BEHIND

This paper argues that rather than finding explanations through comparative methods that emphasize national difference there is a need to explore the processes of students' subjectivities in and through transnational education by focusing on how student subjectivities are shaped in this educational context. The comparative methods give simplified answers to the complexities of such an educational space and will merely keep the analysis fixed on conserving the dichotomy between the West (represented by the Nordic states) and the East (represented by China). Hence, the paper proposes a theoretical framework beyond the comparative approaches which takes the contextual complexities and the situatedness of the processes in transnational education into account. Within this framework, the transnational education spaces will be seen as a global assemblage (Ong & Collier, 2005) that affords different subject position possibilities to different students rather than ascribing their subjectivities to fixed categories such as nationality. The framework takes its point of departure in the situated approach (e.g. Clark & Gieve, 2006; Gu & Schweisfurth, 2006). It bridges the concept of translocal governmentality (Ong, 1999), Popkewitz' deconstruction of the ideal of cosmopolitanism in 20th-century schooling

(Popkewitz, 2007) and the notion of doing intersectionality (Staunæs, 2003). In this framework, the transnational education context will be perceived as a global assemblage in which the translocal governmentality is operating.
The framework enables identification of new modes of subject-making through the doings of intersections of social categories and detection of what Popkewitz calls "the limits of the cosmopolitan citizenry" in the exploration of subjectivity processes in the transnational education setting.

PAPER 2: TRANSFORMATIONS OF CHINESE AND DANISH STUDENTS' PERCEPTION OF THE SIGNIFICANCE OF CULTURE IN TRANSNATIONAL EDUCATION IN CHINA

This paper explores the students' perceptions of the significance of culture to the formation of their identities and citizenry in the transnational university. This exploration is undertaken by first exploring how state-building efforts in China and Denmark are historically embedded in their universities. And secondly by discussing how the students experience the merging of these efforts in the educational practices of the SDC. This paper elucidates that these countries have similar yet different ways of embedding their state-building efforts in their universities. And through the interviews with students about their experiences of the new educational space, the analysis shows that the SDC is a dynamic space, where students' identities and sense of national citizenry are led by the shift in perceptions of cultural diversity in understanding each other's behaviors. We see a shift in perception of culture. The students move from interpreting their own and each other's actions through understandings that link nationality and cultural practices toward an understanding which connects nationality with scientific cultural practices.

PAPER 3: HOW AM I SUPPOSED TO FEEL? FEMALE STUDENTS' EMOTIONAL REASONING ABOUT ACADEMIC BECOMING IN A TRANSNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATIONAL CONTEXT

This paper illustrates the affective academic becoming in transnational education. The affective structuring of students' reasoning about academic identities in transnational education has received very limited attention in this field. The female students' reasoning about their emotional (re)action in the processes of academic becoming is the central focus of this paper. This analysis is conducted through a framework that links Kimberle Crenshaw's (1991) concept of *intersectionality* with a proposed concept of *emotional reasoning* that bridges Sara Ahmed's (2014b) notion of *emotionality* and Thomas Popkewitz' (2009) *rules of reasoning.* The study displays how students' affective positions are shaped by unequal interlockings of gendered, aged and racialized hierarchies. These interlockings can be read as reflections of unequal interlockings of power relations in a transnational educational space. In this space, the students gain differentiated affective possibilities to act depending on whether their body is surfaced as white-young-female or Chinese-young-female.

PAPER 4: CONSTRUCTION OF PLACE-IDENTITIES AND FUTURE ASPIRATIONS FOR THE CITIZENRY IN TRANSNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

This paper focuses on how place and identity in relation to the students' future aspiration are performed in transnational education. It investigates how place and identity are performed by university students in their encounters with students of a different nationality in this kind of university context based on transnational cooperation. The paper argues that in this kind of context the performance of place and identity may be considered as reshaped through the cross-national encounters, as the naturalized practices of place and identity can be seen as disturbed by other kinds of established place-identity performances. The performances are investigated through the spatial concept of *performativity of scale*. This means that the paper zooms in on the ruptures and reiterations to identify how various scaled place-identification processes materialize. The

students' scaled practices of place-identities are transformed and reiterated differently depending on the differentiated interlockings of nationality, gender and age.

PAPER 5: WHAT IS WORTH KNOWING *ABOUT AND FROM* 'THE OTHERS' THROUGH STUDYING ABROAD? A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF INTERNATIONALIZATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION POLICIES AS PART OF NATION-STATE FORMATION IN DENMARK AND CHINA

This paper explores the construction of 'the global' in the national policies of internationalization of higher education and studying abroad in Denmark and China. The construction of 'the global' is scrutinized as part of nation-state building processes, as in these policies certain imaginaries of the nation's future and its citizenry are articulated through assumptions of 'the global', 'global-national relationships' and 'the others' knowledge'. The aim of this paper is to illuminate the reasoning about the need to have knowledge from abroad as part of nation-state building, and how the imaginaries of the relationship between outside and inside (the global narratives) are made over time. The study is based on analysis of national policy documents from the last four decades in the respective nation-states. The analytical results suggest that the narrative of 'the global' is made through imaginaries of 'the nation-state at risk' both in the Danish and Chinese policies of studying abroad. In the case of China, it is about not falling behind even more than it already had in an imagined global economic competition, whereas in the Danish case it was about not to begin to fall behind. In the Danish policies, there is 'shift' in mid-2000s when 'the global' starts to be articulated as demanding educational responses, changing the optimistic tone. In the Chinese case, it is the other way around; from the fear of 'getting beaten' at the end of 1970s to seeing the optimistic prospects in the 2010s. With the shifts of the imaginaries, the promotion of the cultural knowledge only seems to be possible when a certainty of an economic position is established. And that establishment happens through a stabilized 'bank of scientific knowledge'.

CHAPTER 2. STATE OF THE ART AND MY CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE RESEARCH FIELD

In this chapter, I aim to position the present project in the existing research field of transnational higher education. By presenting the central contributions in the field, I aim to highlight not only the shortcomings but also the possibility of analytically thinking the foundation of the phenomenon of transnational education differently. On that background, I will discuss the dissertation's research contributions in relation to the current research approaches and findings. Through the overview of what has been done in the research field and through the description of the theoretical and empirical shoulders in the existing research field upon which the project stands, I will discuss how the research contributions from the present dissertation can give rise to rethinking and refining the existing theoretical and methodological approaches.

The case of the SDC can be perceived as a new empirical research object as it is a new education phenomenon crossing the borders of nation-states through the mobility of the students and programs. This kind of education differs from traditional education as the awarding institution is located in a country other than that of the education programs and the students (Wilkins, 2016). In Knight's terminology, the SDC may be understood as the third generation of what she labels "Crossborder Education" (Knight, 2014). Crossborder Education refers to the "movement of people, knowledge, programs, providers, policies, ideas, curricula, projects, research and services across national or regional jurisdictional borders" (Knight, 2014, p. 44). Crossborder Education can be divided into three different generations: The first generation is about people/student mobility, the second generation features program and provider mobility, while the third generation revolves around education hubs where both program and student move for education purposes (Knight, 2014). Knight (2014) argues that within the field of Crossborder Education, mobility has moved from people (students, faculty, scholars) to programs (twinning, franchise, virtual) and providers (branch campus), and most recently to the concentrated development of the education hubs, of which the SDC is an example. The

categorization of the SDC as an education hub is based on the fact that at the SDC both the people and the program are on the move. The SDC education programs based in Beijing are jointly run by universities from Denmark and China, catering to mainly Chinese and Danish students. However, the Chinese students have a period of stay in Denmark in connection to their thesis where they will be part of a Danish research environment. This is the form of education which Knight (2016) in her later work defines as a new category of transnational education.

Other scholars have also argued that transnational mobility in education is a new emerging thematic field of research (Kosmützky & Putty, 2016). They argue that the research interest and literature have risen along with the exponential increase in different kinds of education with transnational mobility such as joint, dual or franchised programs, online and distance education or the international branch campus. There is a big diversity in how researchers are using different terminology: transnational, offshore, crossborder, borderless to describe similar education phenomena. Kosmützky and Putty (2016) apply the four notions as keywords in their argument of an emerging research field of higher education in their literature review study of transnational mobility in higher education. This dissertation will not discuss further the different usages of the terminology within this field, but will rather remark that because it is an emerging research field the usages of terms might seem confusing and fail to quite capture the same/similar context as that of the SDC. However, by following Knight's (2014, 2016) description of the developments in the field of transnational mobility in relation to education (from people mobility to education hub) and her clarifying concept of education hub the dissertation will argue that it is dealing with a new empirical research object. This also means that the existing research literature about subjectivity processes is very much about the first (about students' adaptation to the new context for learning) and second generations (about the providers' or programs' challenges in adapting to the new context). That might be because the cofounded university center has historically only existed for a fairly short time (since the mid-2000s) compared to the 'traditional' transnational student mobility which has existed for centuries (Kosmützky & Putty, 2016) and the establishment of international branch campuses which has existed since the 1950s (Wilkins, 2016).

The following overview of research literature is a selective one. It focuses on the literature which is about the students' subjectivity processes in transnational higher education. Also literature which provides a historical contextualization of the emergence of this third-generation Crossborder Education will be included.

The following overview will be structured into four parts. The first part describes the dissertation's two points of departure. The second part shows how I rethink the analytical approach to transnational education. The third part describes the dissertation's contribution to the field. This part contains the findings based on ethnographical fieldwork on students' transformations in transnational education. The fourth part inscribes the findings from studies of policies of transnational education in the research field of education migration policies.

TWO DOMINANT POINTS OF DEPARTURE

In the studies of microprocesses of students' subjectivity processes and valorization of their educational performances in a transnational education setting (whether the transnational mobility is regarding the program or the students themselves) two approaches to educational research have been the more dominating: 1) 'the comparative' and 2) the Bourdieu-inspired 'transnational capital' approach. Both approaches focus on students' backgrounds as significant for their academic performance or disposition for future opportunity. However, the processes as aspects of the transformations and disruptions of students' (dis)position for learning in the context of transnational education are rather neglected. The students' backgrounds are either understood through national cultural education behavior (the comparative approach) or as social-cultural learning dispositions (the transnational capital approach).

THE COMPARATIVE APPROACH

The focus of the comparative approach is on analyzing the process of transnational or international education by searching for reasons for the students' actions and academic performances through comparisons of different education systems and their representatives (the students) (Bereday, 1964; Dale, 2003;

Green, Preston, & Janmaat, 2006; Yan, 2010). This approach is built on the imagined homogeneous national education culture which the students are seen to represent. Thus, the culture will become visible in the students' encounters with a foreign system of education. In the native English-speaking universities, especially the Asian international students with origins in a Chinese-speaking country have gained some attention, and been problematized in the education practices as well as in the research of Crossborder Education (in studies such as C. Chan, 2010; Tan, McInerney, & Liem, 2008; Watkins, 2008; Watkins & Biggs, 1996). This attention has grown along with the increased number of students enrolled at the English-speaking universities in the recent decade. These students are sometimes represented as a homogenous group categorized as "Chinese learners" (Grimshaw, 2007; Rastall, 2006). The group is often problematized as displaying "Chinese behaviors in Western classrooms" (Ibid.). This is perceived as a collision between the pedagogy of Western universities and the Chinese tradition of learning, as the actions of Chinese people are described through their affiliation to Confucian Heritage Cultures (J. Chen, 1990; Hofstede, 1984; Hu, 2002; Oxford, 1995). The "Chinese learners" are constructed as being obedient to authority, passive in class, lacking critical thinking and as inadequate in adopting new learning strategies (Atkinson, 1997; Ballard & Clanchy, 1991; Carson, 1992; Hammond, Scott & Gao, 2002; Saravanamuthu & Yap, 2014).

However, in this research field, there are also studies which focus on how 'Chinese learners' and a 'Chinese learning style' are misunderstood by Westerners using an explanatory framework based on "culture-related learning styles and behaviors" (Biggs, 1996; S. Chan, 1999; Wang & Greenwood, 2015). These studies emphasize how the "Chinese mind" functions and why certain styles of learning are preferred by Chinese students through exploring differences between Chinese and Western approaches to teaching and learning (C. Chan, 2010; Hu, 2002). A series of assumptions about Chinese students as a homogeneous group who bring their learning practices unchanged into the new context is implied in both of the frameworks. The critiques of these studies have articulated concerns about the reproduction of stereotypes of the pedagogical subject linked to categories such as "Eastern" and "Western". And thereby they neglect the changing conditions for learning as the comparative studies rely on

dichotomies between Western and Eastern cultures (e.g. Coverdale-Jones, 2006; Jin & Cortazzi, 2006).

TRANSNATIONAL CULTURAL CAPITAL AS EXPLANATORY

In the 'transnational cultural capital' approach, the focus differs from that of the comparative studies. The studies of transnational cultural capital examine strategies for education across nation-state borders or in international schools with a largely global focus as strategies for (re)production of resources for conserving or converting the social position in a global labor market. These studies are based on refinement and extension of the reception of Bourdieu's concept of capital within the research field of international student mobility and transnational education by adding terms such as "transnational", "foreign" and "cosmopolitan" to the concept of capital.

The term "transnational general capital" is applied in Blanck and Börjesson's (2014) and Börjesson's (2005) studies of transnational education strategies among Swedish students studying abroad. I will focus on the relation between the social background of the students and their choice of (non)elite universities abroad. "Transnational cultural capital" has been deployed in Kenway and Koh's (2013) analysis of how the development of students' transnational capital plays a key role in educating the future state nobility for Singapore's field of power. They examine how a Singaporean elite school carefully and successfully educates the future state nobility. In Kim's (2011) effort to combine the notion of global positional competition with Bourdieu's theory of cultural capital in the field of global education, he uses "foreign cultural capital" in his examinations of Korean students' motivations for studying at US graduate schools. The extended term is also utilized in Sin's (2013) exploration of the perceived role of cultural capital, obtained through UK offshore education in Malaysia, in facilitating middle-class social mobility in Malaysia. "Cosmopolitan capital" has been developed by Weenink (2008) in the analysis of the relation between Dutch parents' own social position and their view of cosmopolitan competencies in their investment into their children's internationalized education in the Netherlands. Munk et al. use the concept of cosmopolitan capital to illustrate the relationship between achievement of an elite or non-elite higher education degree among Danes going abroad and their social background (Munk, Foged,

& Mulvad, 2011). In these studies, Bourdieu's concept of capital has been evolved to capture the transnational mobility in education with the main focus on how this transnational mobility is assumed by students or parents as having an effect on the students' future positions and how these strategies are related to their family's current social position.

However, these studies have less focus on the materialization of the capital in transnational education practices. Thus, the exploration of the content of such capitals in education practices which I have worked on earlier (J. H. Li, 2016) complements the research field. The paper shows how these kinds of capital in a transnational educational space are configured; their transformations and their convertibility rather than assuming that they are an automatic mechanism of transnational education. Furthermore, the analysis shows that the national academic capital becomes one of the field-specific capitals deployed in struggles for transnational capital. It is also important to point out that the findings indicate that the transnational cultural capital's convertibility may not only be related to the national field of power as other studies would have it (Börjesson, 2005; J. Kim, 2011; Sin, 2013), nor does it relate to one transnational field of power shaping a transnational class formation the way Weiss' studies (2005) suggest. Rather, my paper indicates that a sufficient work of construction of the field of transnational education will require a mapping of the different national fields of power which are at stake in order to understand the dispositions of the agents.

Using the concept of 'field' applied as framing and theoretical ground has given analytical insight into how students qua their dispositions in a transnational setting as a field of struggle valorize and aspire to optimize different kinds of field-specific capital. However, this framework leaves only limited space for exploring my curiosity about how these dispositions might become disrupted and transformed in the students' struggles for academic performances. Furthermore, I also look at how other aspects than cultural capital (such as emotions and sense of place) might play into the power relations that structure the students' (dis)positions. This framework is an eligible approach to understanding the materialization of the transnational capital, though it keeps its focus on the dispositions in order to understand the struggle and thus limit its

framework to comprehend how potential disruptions of these dispositions might take place.

RETHINKING THE ANALYTICAL APPROACH TO SUBJECTIVITY PROCESSES IN TRANSNATIONAL EDUCATION

This dissertation seeks to capture the processes of transformation and disruption of students' (dis)positions for subjectivity in the context of the third generation of transnational education with inspiration from the so-called "situated approach" (e.g. Clark & Gieve, 2006; Gu, 2015; Gu & Schweisfurth, 2015). Thus it enhances new facets of the research field of transnational higher education.

The situated approach zooms in on how students' values and identities are interrupted and transformed by their encounters with different educational practices. Hence, the attention is on how these encounters shape the educational conditions for subjectivity. The situated approach is the cornerstone of the development of a theoretical framework which captures this process. The framework is described in Paper 1: "Beyond the comparative method in the research of education based on transnational cooperation: Leaving the dichotomy between East and West behind". In the paper I argue that to understand the complexities that take place in the context of transnational education, the explorative lenses must zoom in on the education processes in the institutional situation instead of using the traditional comparative approach to search for the differences and similarities of national cultures of education based on dichotomies (as in Biggs, 1996; Singh & Sproats, 2004; Watkins, 2008) or building on the exploration of the assumptions that the transnational capitals are automatic mechanisms of transnational education. I suggest in this paper a Foucauldian framework based on a refinement of the situated approach (e.g. Clark & Gieve, 2006; Gu & Schweisfurth, 2006) that works with the educational space of transnational cooperation as a global assemblage (Ong & Collier, 2005), providing different subject positions to different students rather than attaching their subjectivities to a certain fixed category such as their nationality. It is based on bridging the concept of translocal governmentality (Ong, 1999), Popkewitz' deconstruction of the ideal of cosmopolitanism in 20th-century schooling (Popkewitz, 2007) and the notion of doing intersectionality (Staunæs, 2003). In this framework, the transnational education context is perceived as a global

assemblage in which the translocal governmentality is operating. Thus, the framework suggests an identification of new modes of subject-making through the doings of intersections of social categories. It furthermore calls for a heightened sensitivity toward what Popkewitz calls "the limits of the cosmopolitan citizenry" in the exploration of subjectification processes in the transnational education setting. Thus, on the one hand, it contributes to the research field of Crossborder Education by creating a new framework inspired by the situated approach focusing on the construction processes of students' subjectivity and position in these institutional settings. On the other hand, it contributes with analytical findings made possible through this new theoretical framework that enables a rethinking of the existing findings in the research field.

TRANSFORMATIONS IN TRANSNATIONAL EDUCATION

It is findings such as the fact that the students' educational practices in this transnational context *are* changing, and that it is happening through the modifications of their perceptions of the significance of nationalized culture in education, that are elucidated in Paper 2: "Transformations of Chinese and Danish students' perceptions of the significance of culture in transnational education in China". The paper shows that in this dynamic educational space, the subject positions for the students are not fixed by nationality or language, as the findings in many studies with a comparative approach suggest (Saravanamuthu & Yap, 2014). Instead, they are flexible, and Chinese students are not seen as lacking the ability to adopt new learning strategies like it is often argued in many studies (Rastall, 2006). However, although the SDC curriculum attempts to denationalize the requirements, it nationalizes them in other ways, as the curriculum requirements are linked to the imagined Danish scientific practices rather than Chinese ones. The possible subject positions produced through the transnational educational practices at the SDC are therefore still nationalized, in the sense that being more or less scientific is strongly attached to national categories.

Other aspects of the students' transformation processes are explored in Paper 3: "How am I supposed to feel? Female students' emotional reasoning about academic becoming in a transnational higher educational context". This paper

focuses on how the students' reasoning about academic becoming is linked to transformations of their emotionality[2] (Ahmed, 2014b, 2014a; D'Aoust, 2014). This is illustrated through a proposed framework of 'emotional reasoning' that bridges emotions and reasoning. Through this lens, it is explored how female students make reason about their feelings depending on how they take up the intersections of the social categories that are possible for them. The analysis shows that the surfaces and boundaries of students' bodies are created through emotions, i.e. that the ways that students (re)act to study pressure interplay with the configuration of how they are interlocked by social categories. Hence it shows different transformations of emotionality in the students' maneuverings of the requirements of the transnational curriculum. The students' affective positions are thus shaped by unequal interlockings of gendered, aged and racialized hierarchies. There is a double movement in the marginalization of the female students, namely the necessity of empowerment and the embodiment of the dominant affective structure for reasoning which is attached to Western-old-white-masculinity. Furthermore, possibilities for negotiations of marginalization for the female students are differentiated structurally reliant on whether their body appears as white-young-female or Chinese-young-female. The results illustrate that transnational education is also a sort of transformative space where students can exercise their 'capacity' for governing their emotions and emotional reactions.

Through this paper, the dissertation makes contributions to the research field in two ways. First, the findings in this paper of the dissertation contribute to the research field by elucidating the affective aspects of the microprocesses of transnational education, which have received very little attention in this field as the focus on 'culture' and 'language' is often overexposed and reproduced (see the studies with a comparative approach mentioned earlier). Second, the proposal of the new framework "emotional reasoning" which pursues to connect emotion and rationality as a theoretical concept works as another contribution to the field, as the theoretical framework seeks to accommodate what Kenway & Youdell (2011) argue is the need to deal with emotion in new ways that both

[2] Emotions are in Sara Ahmed's model treated as social and cultural practices rather than psychological modes. This is an effort to move away from previewing emotions as residential in the subject. To Ahmed, feelings do not exist in subject or object, but are made as effects of movement (Ahmed, 2014b, 2014a).

problematize and go beyond the refusal of emotion and 'emotional rationality' in education (Kenway & Youdell, 2011).

In the research field of transnational education, the aspects of spatial performances of place-identity practices (Gregson & Rose, 2000) have attracted somewhat less attention. Seldom are the issues of students' sense of place in their transnational mobilities analyzed through the spatial relations between the places (Raghuram, 2013). When discussing the production of place as identity marker in transnational higher education, the research is often engaged in issues of student motivations and decisions in moving from one place to another and the impact of place in their identity processes (T. Kim, 2009; Waters, Brooks, & Pimlott-Wilson, 2011).

However, there are few recent studies (Cheng, 2014; Holloway, O'Hara, & Pimlott-Wilson, 2012; Leung & Waters, 2013; Michael Singh, Kenway, & Apple, 2007) on identity-making in the students' transnational mobilities, which shows that identities are constructed through place distinctions and comparisons. And these are constitutive of students' ways of making sense of their own education migration experiences. A contribution to this sprouting field of research is to explore the geographical scales which the students' sense of place and identity are producing and how the scaled production of place and identity is linked to social categories such as nationality and gender. It is to question how students' place-identity practices – which to them seemed to be so naturalized – become challenged, and the effects produced in those processes. This is explored in Paper 4: "Construction of place-identities and future aspirations for the citizenry in transnational higher education". In this paper, I deal with how differently scaled place-identification (Kaiser & Nikiforova, 2006, 2008) processes materialize and become entangled in the lives of student subjects in a transnational context such as the SDC.

The paper discusses the materialization of the place-identity practices in relation to the practices of future aspirations as the performativity of a transnational space. The future aspiration is a theme which is interesting to focus on as the theme is something that all students reflect upon in their choices connected to the education program at the SDC. Through the examples, I identified that the scaled practices of place-identity are shaped through a certain performance of

intersections between nationality, gender and age. The transnationally scaled place-identity as the anticipated and desired future seems to be more possible for Danish male students than any other group of students. This shows that the spatial relations in transnational education function as scaled identity politics which structure the students' aspirations unequally and shape their sense of cosmopolitan citizenry differently through the various ways that nationality, gender and age are interlocked.

Summing up, the main contribution of this dissertation to the research field of transnational higher education is to study new educational phenomena, that is phenomena such as the SDC which I explore through two layers: the microprocesses of the lived education lives of students and the processes in policies and strategies for internationalization and studying abroad. The contributions described so far are related to the first layer of the dissertation's work, namely to explore the concrete microprocesses of the lived education lives of students in such a context. These contributions can be summed up in three categories: 1) the argument about the need to explore the materialization of transnational cultural capital through focusing on transformations, 2) a proposed framework that goes beyond the comparative approach in studies of microprocesses of transnational education, and 3) showing different aspects of transformations in students' academic becoming in transnational education.

UNDERSTANDING TRANSNATIONAL EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS BEYOND METHODOLOGICAL NATIONALISM

The other layer is to explore the political-historical context in which these third generations of transnational education institutions are embedded and conditioned. My objective is to lend this kind of education a political-historical context which I rarely see in the studies of transnational education. In this dissertation, it is accomplished by comparing the policies and strategies for internationalization and transnational movements in education over time for the involved countries Denmark and China. The contribution here is also a methodological one.

Studies of policies regarding education migration have often been informed by the dominant paradigm and discourses of the 'human capital' theory. Here the

national economic growth and competitiveness are linked to economic capital which again is linked with human capital (Fahey & Kenway, 2010). These studies with economic perspectives have been concerned with the relationship between education migration and modernization of nation-states, often using the concepts of "brain drain" (Cao, 2008; Pan, 2011), "brain gain" (Ma & Pan, 2015; Ross & Lou, 2005) and "brain circulation" (W. Li, Yu, Sadowski-Smith, & Wang, 2015; Mok & Han, 2016; Rizvi, 2005). The studies informed by the dominant paradigm of human capital underpin the assumption of a one-to-one relationship between territory, identity, identification and citizenship, which is contested by newer studies showing a more nuanced and complex picture of these kinds of relationship (Q. Chen, 2014; Gu, 2015; Kenway & Fahey, 2009). Furthermore, the studies are largely locked into a form of 'methodological nationalism' and fail to understand mobility within individual and situated contexts (Q. Chen, 2017). Methodological nationalism can be related to the emergence of social science and how these sciences have dealt with issues, where the limits/territory of its exploration have been the nation-state without questioning the borders or historicity of that entity. And hence methodological nationalism is critiqued for leaving no room for the interconnectivity of transnational territories in the historical construction processes of the nation-state (Levitt & Schiller, 2006; Wimmer & Schiller, 2003).

In this research field some focus on the education migration policies in relation to nation-state construction has been demonstrated through a historical perspective (e.g. T. Kim, 2009; Rhoads, 2011). However, questions which are less explored in depth are those regarding the imaginaries of a nation-state's future and its citizenry that are embedded in the constructions of the social problem those students of education migration are expected to handle. Questions of the kind of knowledge that seemed to *be worth* transferring or gathering from the education migration are also less explored in depth. These issues are especially inadequately explored through a comparative perspective, but they are dealt with in Paper 5. The paper applies a comparative method through a transnational historical perspective (Buchardt & Du, 2018) to capture the different nation-states' policy and strategy of internationalization of education as part of nation-state crafting. This approach has the advantage of avoiding *methodological nationalism* (Wimmer & Schiller, 2003) by questioning nation-state building through transnational movement of education rather than taking

the national framing of state and societies for granted as its analytical frame. Furthermore, the paper's exploration of how these transnational processes form the national boundaries and are thus seen as part of the nation-state foundation may exactly accommodate the critique of methodological nationalism (Levitt & Schiller, 2006). The findings in the paper show aspects of the nation-states' building processes in which the transnational processes become vital to the nation-states in order to define their territories and citizenry. The paper also explores how these imaginaries are linked to how the nation-states position themselves in a so-called economic globalization. And also how the need and worth of certain kinds of knowledge transform over time as the way the nation-states see their role in global competition changes. Furthermore, by perceiving the emergence of education hubs historically and not as a singular event in the history of transnational movements (also in education) but as part of nation-state building, the paper stands on the shoulders of scholars such as Wimmer & Schiller (2003) among many others. They have argued that the concept of the modern nation-state with its national population has developed across borders rather than staying within the territorially limited national spaces. It is worth noting that even though it is the dissertation's aim to overcome the methodological nationalism by way of constructing the research object and the methodologies for the investigations, it cannot fully avoid that methodological nationalism will influence and shape its perspective, as it will be impossible to develop a theoretical language without the influence of the social and political forces surrounding us (Wimmer & Schiller, 2003).

However, drawing on the transnational historical perspective to explore the building of the nation-state is an attempt to put the blinders of methodological nationalism aside. Thus, the dissertation also engages in historicizing some of the ways in which transnational education migration became part of nation-state building in different nation-states. It strives to comprehend transnational movements in education in relation to historically transnational processes as part of nation-state creation in general. In the exploration of the policies of internationalization of education and studying abroad in a transnational historical perspective, this dissertation makes its contribution to the research field of transnational higher education by showing how the transnational education processes shape the ways that nation-states are built, rather than exploring the nation-state as an entity with fixed boundaries that creates education and student subjects. Another contribution is a framework that enables

comparisons of two nation-states' policies without turning to methodological nationalism.

CHAPTER 3. REFLECTIONS ON THE THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK(S)

This chapter is an addition to Paper 1 which forms the dissertation's analytical foundation. The paper is a theoretical paper that argues for the theoretical framework in the study of the microprocesses in transnational education. This chapter seeks to create an overall picture of the theoretical foundation that the dissertation as a whole builds upon. It is done by first clarifying how the important term "transnational" is applied throughout the dissertation. Second, my reflections on how the theoretical frameworks in the different empirical papers 'fit' together are described in the chapter. Third, the chapter provides a theoretical framework for the policy studies which make up the second layer of the dissertation's exploration.

TRANSNATIONAL EDUCATION AS RESEARCH OBJECT AND PERSPECTIVE

In this dissertation, I use the term 'transnational education' in two ways: as the research object and as a theoretical perspective. As the research object, I choose to view education institutions like the SDC as transnational education rather than international education, following Knight's (2016) empirical observations. However, the choice is also based on the assumption that the SDC can be conceptualized as a new and emerging *transnational educational space* which transcends and transforms the education that is undertaken under the regularities of one nation-state. Drawing on the analytical approaches from migration research such as Burawoy et al. (2000) and Faist, Fauser, and Reisenauer (2013) who argue that the transnational space consists of new connections, and combinations that are made by movements across national borders, I question the formation of the crossborder connections and combinations.

I do so to put the flows and movements of people, ideas, curriculum, social practices and imaginaries, etc., that transcend the imagined borders of the nation-state and transform the space of education and its participants under

scrutiny (this is discussed more in depth in Paper 1). This means that I try to illuminate how education that becomes transnational can be grasped analytically. In Paper 2, for instance, the question becomes how knowledge (seen as connected to a certain nationality or nationalized student bodies) is transforming across nation-states, and how knowledge seen as a national entity is disturbed and negotiated through the encounters between students of different nationalities.

Theoretically, I employ a transnational historical perspective with a comparative method as an approach to capture the handling of educational issues across nation-states (Buchardt & Du, 2018; Kubow & Fossum, 2007) and to discuss how the developments in the different contexts respectively global and national are mutually presupposing each other (Andreasen & Ydesen, 2016; Christensen & Ydesen, 2015). This is to enable an understanding of the historically, spatially and socially intertwined character of education (Sobe, 2013). It means that I work from a standpoint where the transnational processes of education are seen as interplaying with borders and imaginations of borders of the national territories, and that these processes become part of national-state (re)foundation. The unfolding of the concept of the transnational as a theoretical perspective is described in detail in the later section "Framework for the policy studies" as well as in Paper 5.

HOW DO THE THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS IN THE DIFFERENT PAPERS FIT TOGETHER?

This dissertation is based on a Foucauldian-inspired framework. The dissertation draws upon different scholars' reworks and refinements of his concepts of subjectivity, power and knowledge reappropriated and applied to particular objects in specific research fields. The dissertation is indebted to the following scholars and their reworking of Foucauldian concepts or Foucault-based concepts: 'subject position' (Buchardt, 2014; Plum, 2010) and 'systems of reasoning' (Popkewitz, 1997) which throughout the dissertation's research processes have been connected with different other Foucauldian scholars' concepts such as "translocal governmentality" (Ong & Collier, 2005), "problematisation" (Plum, 2014), "emotionality" (Ahmed, 2014b), "performativity" (Butler, 1993) "performativity of scale" (Kaiser & Nikiforova, 2008) and "intersectionality" (Staunæs, 2004).

In the different papers, I bridge these concepts in order to propose different theoretically grounded analytical frameworks to explore the specific themes that are found in and through the (Foucault-informed) ethnographical fieldwork and policy studies. The bridging allows the dissertation to work context- and object-sensitively and to make spaces for a profound exploration through the particular developed optic or apparatus for a posteriori themes. One of the examples of a bridging framework is 'emotional reasoning' that links emotionality (Ahmed, 2014b) and system reasoning (Popkewitz, 1997). The framework was proposed as the way in which the dissertation seeks to capture issues of emotion (which was an unexpected theme prior to the ethnographical fieldwork) in this kind of transnational education.

With the papers' illumination of the different facets of the construction process of students' subjectivities in higher education programs based on transnational cooperation between Denmark and China and the policy-historical contextualization of the cooperation, the dissertation pieces together a Foucauldian-informed analysis of the relations between transnational higher education, nation-state building and student subjectivity and identity.

FRAMEWORK FOR THE POLICY STUDIES: ADDITION TO THE THEORETICAL PAPER WHICH DEALS WITH THE ETHNOGRAPHICAL PART OF THE EMPIRICAL MATERIAL

This part is an additional framework to the theoretical framework which is developed with the intention of exploring the lived lives of students in the context of the third generation of transnational education. The additional part of the framework aims to construct a framework that makes it possible to investigate the education migration policies and strategies in relation to nation-state building through a comparative transnational historical perspective. This is in order to grasp the historical context in which these third generations of transnational education institutions are embedded and conditioned, using the policies and strategies for internationalization and transnational movement in education for the countries Denmark and China as historical examples.

As mentioned in the state-of-the-art section, historicizing the ways education migration becomes strategies for nation-building through a comparative lens has been granted less focus in the research literature. This dissertation will thus aim to contribute with attention to the comparative explorations of policies from a historical perspective.

This comparative method of policies finds its point of departure in the "issues-oriented approach" of Comparative Education research (Kubow & Fossum, 2007, p. 22 f). The objective is to form a transnational historical perspective to capture the different nation-states' policies and strategies of education migration as part of nation-state building. The approach advocates for going beyond national boundaries in the examination of educational issues in order to shed light on the transnational character of educational challenges. In this way, the focus in the comparison becomes the issues rather than the systems. The 'issues-oriented approach' emphasizes that it is essential to do the comparative examination through an analytical framework, as this will help the reader to critically examine the educational issues systematically (Kubow & Fossum, 2007). The analytical framework for the comparative studies will in this dissertation be informed by the Foucauldian concept of problematization (Foucault, 1990; Plum, 2014). This concept enables a tracing of the system of reason as practices of cultural theses that shape the global citizen and the cosmopolitan future (Popkewitz, 2007). Through the concept of problematization, the analytical lenses pay attention to the concrete 'solutions' or 'answers' which are articulated as the reaction to the 'problems', 'worries' and 'attentions' and 'challenges' of specific issues that the education migration is assumed to be the solution to. In this Foucauldian framework, the way objects are shaped and defined can be explored through the processes of knowledge which are tied to political rationalities of the governing configurations of our individuality (Foucault, 2002c; Popkewitz, 2000). This means that the dissertation's attention is on how certain attributions of the subject are fashioned and fashioned in the processes of what appears as a relevant object of knowledge (Plum, 2014) in the policies of historical cases of education migration as strategies for nation-state building.

Noah Sobe (2013) argues through his concept of *entanglement* that studies that aim at being transnational should quest for *the apparatuses (dispositif)*, matrices for thinking and acting by looking at a "[…] heterogeneous set consisting of

discourses, institutions, laws, administrative measures, scientific statements, philosophical, moral, and philanthropic propositions" (Sobe, 2013, pp. 101–102, paraphrasing Foucault 1980, pp. 194–196). Thus the concept allows research to understand the historically, spatially and socially intertwined character of education as it strives to comprehend assemblages that gather and piece time, space and sources together (Sobe, 2013). The entanglement approach opens the prospects of going beyond a one-to-one comparison (Buchardt & Du, 2018). This comparative scope includes both the extension of the national boundaries and takes the contextual differences that relate to the nation-states and their education systems into account qua their particular historical development (Buchardt & Du, 2018). The main comparative aim of the dissertation is neither to demonstrate whether there is an increase or erasure of the differences between systems and pedagogical cultures (like the Stanford school would have it), nor to display that persistent differences are creating dynamics (as according to the comparative research of the Humboldt school) (J. E. Larsen, 2013). Rather, the ambition is twofold. First, I wish to describe how *reasonings* of education migration become responses to an emerged *need to gain knowledge and inspiration from abroad* (understood as other nation-states). Second, the objective is to capture the cross-national character of educational challenges by describing the reasonings in the formal national policies and strategies through a transnational perspective.

CHAPTER 4. THE RESEARCH PROCESSES – WORKING WITH QUALITATIVE METHODOLOGIES WITHIN A POSTSTRUCTURALIST THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The purpose of this chapter is to create transparency of how the empirical materials and the research object are mutually constructed. It is equally important to make visible how these constructions are informed by the theoretical framework. As Hastrup (1999) contends, the research object in humanities is not unchangeable and independent of the theoretical interest. This is especially the case if the project works within the theoretical framework of poststructuralist approaches[3] like this project does, where the object of analysis is understood as fluid, unstable and ambiguous. This has certain consequences for the methodological choices and the following analysis. Thus, the methodological reflections will not only relate to the role of the researcher but to the whole process of how the researcher and her theoretical approach are part of the construction of the empirical material whether the materials are created through interviews, observations or selections of document materials (Järvinen & Mik-Meyer, 2005). Hence the aim of this research project with its poststructuralist-informed framework is to contribute new aspects to the world rather than solve some already given problem (Hastrup, 1999) as it does not take the already existing social categories for granted but instead 'makes a problem' of them (Young, 1971). This dissertation thus operates within the framework of what Chouliaraki (2000) defines as "constructivist ontology" or "realistic epistemology". This means that the world is perceived as constructed, but the way we can acknowledge/create knowledge about it is through understanding it as a real thing (Kofoed, 2003).

[3] Poststructuralism is not a coherent theory but rather varied propositions of critical strategies to disturb the norms that are taken for granted and those unquestioned social reproductions (Staunæs, 2004, p. 83).

The methods which have been employed and those methodological reflections which have been important for the empirical material construction processes and refining the sub-research questions will be described in this chapter. This project attempts to understand the transnational educational conditions for the emergence of subjectivities through mixed methodologies from the qualitative tradition that combines poststructuralist ethnography (Gordon, Holland, & Lahelma, 2001) and policy-historical source studies in an interactive perspective (Järvinen & Mik-Meyer, 2005). This means that I have been struggling with the frictions between the theoretical framework and the qualitative methodologies qua their differences in the ontological assumptions of the subject: On one hand the ethnographical subject as the experiencing, interpreting, meaning-creating, etc. (which the qualitative research tradition aims to capture), and on the other hand the decentered subject as positions that become possible qua the historical discursive structures in which it is embedded (which is my theoretical grounding based on the Foucauldian readings, see Paper 1 for the theoretical framework). This concerns the students as both subjects and research objects in this case, and the researcher as a subject. I am working from a theoretical standpoint which is not interested in the subject's meaning formation in itself. Understanding the individual subject's experiences and interpretations is not my ambition here. Rather, I am interested in understanding the student subjects' experiences and interpretations in order to identify how their ascriptions of meaning are exposing certain forms of power relations and structures in which their positions are following certain rules of reasoning. This implies that I am not searching for the students' or the author's intentions or 'real' meaning in the observations, interviews and document materials. It also means that my exploration of the practices that shape students' identities and ideals of the citizenry in transnational education and the historical contextualization of these practices should not be viewed in relation to such an intentional framework. Nor should my researcher-subject be understood as having a special fundamentally human interpretation quality. Rather, the researcher's agency should be seen as practices constituted by entanglements of theoretical perspectives, methodologies, documents, research instruments (audio recorder, cameras and other materials), etc. (Plum, 2010).

For the ethnographical part of my research, it is important to stress how my physical bodily appearance and language ability (ascribed to different social categories of nationality, gender and age by the field) also shape my research

agency. This will be discussed more in depth in the section on ethnographic fieldwork – how the categories of female, young and sometimes Chinese, sometimes Danish and sometimes both play different roles in different situations, affecting what the researcher can see and 'know'. In the following, I aim to make it transparent how these qualitative approaches are not utilized in a 'traditional' manner, but rather how they are applied in the Foucauldian-informed theoretical framework. The chapter is written as a reconstruction of the processes for the empirical material production, so the methodological reflections that emerged in the processes are included. This is done in order to avoid the 'subjectivism' in the research understood as non-transparency and arbitrariness in the transformations of empirical materials for analysis. The chapter strives to map the steps in the processes in which the research knowledge becomes formed (Plum, 2010).

This chapter is divided into five main parts. The first part is about the poststructuralist ethnographic fieldwork as the point of departure. It includes different considerations in doing participant observation, introduction to the class I have followed, taking field notes, etc. The second part is about the analytical shifts that happened during the observations. The third part is about the positions and roles I took on and was assigned. I call these 'go-between' positions which will be explained later. The fourth part deals with how the ethnographical interviews are conducted. The fifth part is a description of how the policy studies complement the ethnographical part. And finally, the chapter ends with an overview of the different types of empirical materials which form the foundation of my analysis.

POSTSTRUCTURALIST ETHNOGRAPHICAL FIELDWORK

The point of departure for the ethnographic part of my work is based on poststructuralist ethnographically inspired fieldwork which also includes semi-structured interviews. The poststructuralist ethnography in an education setting can be characterized as using an ethnographical approach to capture the microprocesses of a classroom and the experience of students where the constructions of student agency or subject positions are understood as discursively produced (see e.g. the work of Davies & Harré, 1990; Kofoed, 2007;

Buchardt, 2014; Staunæs, 2004). And as mentioned above, the role of the researcher as co-producer of the microprocesses is important to be discussed as both ethnography and poststructuralism emphasize that it is part of the making of transparency in knowledge production (Gordon et al., 2001). The conventional definition of ethnography in an educational setting emphasizes that it is fieldwork that requires participant observation of everyday life in 'naturally occurring settings' in education over longer periods of time (Alvesson, 2003; Delamont & Atkinson, 1995), which can give insight into an understanding of how people make and construct social categorizations in their social and cultural context (Alvesson, 2003; Ambrosius Madsen, 2003). However, with the discussions of the researcher's neutrality [4] in ethnographical work and the poststructuralist approach to the object as fluid, it becomes more explicit that 'the naturally occurring settings' cannot be observed, as the researcher cannot avoid being part of the context and interact with actors of the field.

Even though the fieldwork is a method to gain knowledge about social categories that emerge, are maintained or change within the frames of particular social communities (Hastrup, 2010, p. 55), the researcher's role in partaking in the construction of the social categories according to this perspective must also be scrutinized. This project has the focus exactly on how students construct and negotiate subject positions through the social categories that emerge, are maintained and change in this new community in the classroom of the SDC. This can be grasped by the ethnographical approach as it focuses on how the social categories and events are ascribed in the life of the SDC. In my work, I understand the ethnographical fieldwork as the process in which the knowledge about the complexity of human coexistence is created (Hastrup, 2003, p. 15). The researcher's co-construction in that complexity she is studying is also in focus, however without falling into the 'trap' of turning the ethnography into

[4] The discussions about the fieldwork's neutrality are not new in the ethnographical tradition. The ideal of neutrality has undergone different changes over time, especially with the publications of the unofficial field notes in the 1960s of the central figure Bronislaw Malinowski's ethnographic work on the Trobriand Islands from the beginning of the 20th century. In these field notes it was clear that the ideal of neutrality could not be maintained practically speaking (Buchardt, 2006). Hastrup & Ovesen (1985) (with Malinowski as example) argue for including in the construction of the ethnographical materials considerations of the circumstances under which they were created as part of the methodological reflections.

auto-ethnography (Alvesson, 2003; Delamont, 2009). The injection of the poststructuralist perspective entails an awareness of the fluidity of the analytic object. Hence, the ethnographical fieldwork becomes about capturing the fluidity of the study object (the students' positions) without essentializing it. For this dissertation's work, it means that I seek to understand through ethnographical fieldwork the patterns of how the student positions are constructed rather than understanding them as persons. And also how I, too, become part of those constructions.

Through the unique opportunity I had, i.e. being able to follow the Master class from the very beginning of their study (I met the students at the same time as most of the students met each other for the very first time on the introduction day to the courses), I gained access to observing how the social categorization in the complexity of students' coexistence emerged and later transformed in the class. Thus with the fieldwork, this project aims at gaining a participant perspective on people's everyday lives in order to see the prioritizations and the logic which motivate action and make sense locally (Gulløv & Højlund, 2003, p. 17). The prioritizations and logics motivating students' actions and making sense locally are in this project's perspective seen as effects of translocal governmentalities (Ong, 1999, p. 6) where the search for the effects is a search for how 'reason' and 'the reasonable person' are produced (Popkewitz, 2000, pp. 16–17).

So the logic motivating the students' actions is understood from their perspective as their own and articulated through their body of flesh and blood (the participant perspective). Theoretically and analytically, this logic is viewed as historically discursive constructions through which the individual's action can be expressed (Foucault, 2002b, p. 211) (the analytical perspective). However, during the fieldwork, my role as fieldworker was also conditioned by the ways that the educational space allows one to think about the interaction between me and the students and among the students themselves as interactions between human *beings*. It means that my participant observations are based on the requirement that I had to relate to the students as people more than positions.

The tension between the participant and analytical perspectives is essential to ethnography, as it is important to understand the perspectives of people in order

to describe their prioritizations and logics. And it is important in the ethnographical tradition to develop an analytical understanding of perspectives which may differ from the way people see themselves in the world (Hammersley, 2006). However, the issues of doing Foucauldian-informed poststructuralist ethnography and analysis, the tensions between different assumptions of the subject in the ethnographical tradition and the decentered subject as a position in a theoretical framework drawing on Foucauldian readings go beyond the discussion of tensions between the participant and analytical perspectives. This makes it even more important to address the issues of the tension during and after my fieldwork. It is not merely the tensions between the participant and analytical perspective, but also as tensions between how different ontological assumptions of the subject are at stake in different 'phases' of the fieldwork and theoretical-analytical work. The chapter thus seeks to deal with these tensions as a fundamental part of doing poststructuralist ethnography through creating transparency in the research processes.

In this project, the theoretically informed analytical perspective was constructed as a broad frame before the fieldwork took place, which means that the analytical perspective was already from the beginning of the fieldwork a filter for my lenses. This meant, for example, that I was trying to understand the students' actions and performances not so much as who they were as persons but rather how certain positions became available for them to take. For instance, in my conversations with the students, I was noticing how certain social categories were brought to the fore in their narratives of what is possible for them or not. When I was talking to some female students about their dreams of future places to live, the focus was on how they 'draw on' the categories of being young and female as most important in their reasoning of their possibilities.

The main argument throughout the reconstruction of the research processes in which the poststructuralist ethnographical fieldwork forms a crucial part is to afford transparency regarding 1) how the spaces for the ways the students can share thoughts and feelings with me in different talks are created by my *around-the-clock* physical presence in the spaces throughout the duration of the fieldwork and the different roles I am assigned 2) how these roles also allow me to shift the analytical focus at different times during the fieldwork 3) how I work with different ontological assumptions of the subject that are at stake in different 'phases' of the research processes.

PARTICIPANT OBSERVATIONS

The participant perspective requires participation in the field as interviews and surveys are not sufficient to create knowledge about humans' actions, seeing that the reasons for these actions are often not conscious (Gulløv & Højlund, 2003, p. 17). The participant perspective shall in relation to the theoretical framework in this project be seen as a source to identify the regularities of how the subjects as the reasonable person at the SDC are produced. The participant perspective is hence a way to localize the ongoing social categorization practices (Staunæs, 2004) employed in the governing principles in the everyday lives of these 'educated subjects' (Popkewitz, 2000).

My fieldwork was a mutual action between participation in other people's everyday lives combined with observation and systematic reflections about the observed (Gulløv & Højlund, 2003, pp. 18–19). The reciprocal action is called participant observation. The participant observation has for me been a double-sided process as it, on one hand, requires closeness to be able to understand the interactions between the participants in the field and on the other hand requires distance to be able to interpret the observed (Alvesson, 2003). Therefore it was up to me as an ethnographer to keep the balance between the gained insights and the interpretations thereof through reflectivity (Gulløv & Højlund, 2003, pp. 21–23).

The reflectivity is important because the ethnographer will be put in a position as her own informant where seeing the context 'objectively' is not possible as the ethnographer becomes a part of the context (Hastrup, 1988, p. 221). The approach thus requires that the researcher participates in the field over a longer period of time, and that the researcher is careful with reflections on how and why she has constructed those materials (Ambrosius Madsen, 2003, p. 8). My fieldwork reflections of what and which circumstances have been crucial for how and why I created those empirical materials the way I did and which insights these materials gave are illustrated in the following descriptions. They are descriptions of the different degrees and ways of my participation.

Furthermore, I will elucidate how these participations were guiding the ways I was 'moving' between the participant and analytical perspectives in the construction of the empirical materials.

Rubow (2003) argues that there is no consensus in the academic literature about what participant observation precisely covers. She suggests instead that the participation and observations must be adjusted to the particular research project and context with which one is dealing. How I adjusted the participation and observation in the context of the SDC will be explained through the descriptions of the interplays between participation and observation. This means showing my movements between different degrees of participation and observations during my stay in the field.

CONSIDERATIONS OF THE DURATION OF THE FIELDWORK

There were many considerations at stake when I was planning my main fieldwork at the SDC for the project. The questions were basically about which class, when, where and for how long I should follow the students. The considerations and the choices I ended up with were based on the pilot study I conducted in the summer of 2013 in Beijing and the summer of 2014 in Copenhagen. In the pilot study, I did qualitative interviews with 15 students (Danish and Chinese) from different Master programs about their experiences of study challenges during their everyday lives and their aspirations for the future. This kind of interview is suitable to unfold multi-faceted and often contrasting articulations of experiences and frames of orientation and interpretation. I have viewed the interviews as a social encounter between the interviewer and the actors, where the topic for the conversation is prearranged, and the purpose is to produce the narrative about the student's reality and the way she or he ascribes meaning to it (Staunæs & Søndergaard, 2005). These students were all first-year Master students enrolled at the SDC. Through the interviews, many of the students were engaged in telling me about their first impressions of the SDC and pointing at the chaos and newness of this kind of educational space at the beginning of their first semester. They compared the beginning with the somewhat more stabilized situation they were in at the time of the interview.

Many of the students expressed that they became used to things around the Christmas party[5], or at the end of the first semester. The chaos might reflect the newness of the SDC and that the SDC was still in an embryonic stage at that point as an educational institution. However, it also portrayed the SDC as an educational space based on transnational cooperation with both faculty and students coming with different national experience, having the potentiality of being more dynamic: A dynamic space that is more open for negotiations of what should become the structures of the SDC – academically as well as socially. It piqued my curiosity how this space became more stabilized. This entails which social categories became the stable and dominating ones for the students, and what kinds of struggles were at stake in the making of the more stabilized environment.

Although the interviews gave some insight into these processes, I decided to explore these processes in depth through conducting fieldwork too. I decided to follow one Master class rather than several, as I did not only want to get familiar with the rhythms of their study lives but also knowing these in detail and being a part of that. This was to enable me to understand and describe the logics they ascribed to their actions and reflections. When I had to decide which program I wanted to explore, I selected the natural science disciplines rather than the social science ones. The reason was to be as far away from my own academic background as possible. It was an attempt to create a distance to the academic content of the courses, so I could concentrate on the interactions among the students in the observations rather than 'get caught up' in the academic content of the courses. I decided to follow the class for almost four months, from late August (the introduction days) to mid-December (around the Christmas party).

In March 2015 I wrote to one of the administrative staff members at the SDC, with whom I had been in contact during the pilot study, and asked who and which program might be interested in having me follow their program. She

[5] SDC has the annual tradition of organizing a Christmas party for students as the equivalent to the Danish "julefrokost" the week before Christmas Eve. "Julefrokost" is a Danish tradition where people get together with their families, at workplaces and other social networks and eat special food such as marinated herring and meatballs and drink schnapps and make Christmas decorations. During my fieldwork I also participated in this annual SDC event.

replied that in principle all the programs could be open for that, but maybe I should try the Program of Science and natural resources. This was the program she was most familiar with, and the coordinators are quite accommodating. I then invited the two coordinators for the program to meet in April. The meeting took place at the office of one of the professors in Copenhagen. I presented my project and my preliminary ideas for fieldwork, they were very interested and said that I could follow the new class of 2015, provided that the students and the teacher did not mind, which they did not think they would. The duration was up to me. We agreed that I should ask the students and teachers when I arrived at the SDC in August.

This dissertation works upon the principle of anonymity. This means that the names of the Master program and the participants I followed are fictional – made up for the purpose of protecting the students', teachers' and staff's anonymity. Furthermore, the information in the excerpts from the interviews and observations which can lead to an identification of the person has been blurred. The practice of blurring the personally identifiable information means that in my analysis and the selected excerpts, some information has been left out or replaced with fictional information. However, this is done with the sensitivity to not changing or losing the crucial meaning.

THE STUDENTS AND THE PHYSICAL STRUCTURE AROUND THE CLASS

The class consisted of around 20 students aged 20-30. There were a few more female students than male students. The majority of the students were from China, some were from Denmark, and a few were EU citizens from other countries. They had very different Bachelor degrees such as environmental science or engineering, biology, chemistry, geography, geology, ecology, agriculture engineering, etc. The official teaching language at the SDC is English. However, during the classes and outside classes English, Mandarin and Danish are used among the students. The first module consists of more than 10 teachers, mostly from Danish universities.

The SDC building with the most teaching activities is part of the Zhongguanchun Campus of the University of Chinese Academy of Sciences (UCAS). The UCAS Zhongguanchun Campus is located in the northwestern part of Beijing. The class has almost all the lectures in the same teaching room. The room is arranged with the teacher's desk, a big blackboard and a PowerPoint projector, the desks are organized in three tiers with nine rows. Each desk will accommodate two students. It is only the first four-five rows which are used by students. This arrangement is very steady, only very few times during my fieldwork did I observe that the furniture had been moved by the students[6]. There is a student dormitory on campus where all the students from the class are living. During my stay, I could not stay at the campus dormitory. I had a shared apartment within a 15-minute walking distance from the campus. That deprived me of 'living with them around the clock'. However, because the students' program was usually very tight, they spent most of their waking hours in the teaching building. And having my own apartment with a living room and a kitchen (the dorms did not have those facilities) became valuable later, as I could invite the students over, and many expressed that they were missing that home atmosphere.

The curriculum of this Master program was organized in such a way that all courses were compulsory. That meant that all the students in the class had to follow the same courses. The schedule for Module 1 for the students was quite tight. Almost every weekday they had lectures from 8:30am-4:30pm or 5pm with a lunch break between 11:30am-1:30pm. Beside Wednesday and Friday when they 'only' had lectures in the Master program 8:30-11:30am, in the afternoon the class was divided: The Chinese students attended the compulsory course of Political Science and the Danish and international students went to Chinese language courses. The field trips were mostly a weekend activity during Module 1. Besides the lectures, they had to read literature and do assignments with rather short deadlines. This tight structure and heavy workload was something most students complained about to each other and to me. This

[6] The physical organizations and stabilities of the pedagogical space which many other scholars deal with (e.g. Ehn, Löfgren, & Wilk, 2016; Gulløv & Højlund, 2005; Martinussen & Larsen, 2018) are not in the focus of this dissertation.

displays that the physical structure of the program was part of shaping how students could ventilate their frustrations in the classroom's collective space.

FOLLOWING THE CLASS

By following the class, I planned to do participant observation of as many academic and social activities as possible in those four months. This also included doing three rounds of interviews during the period with students as well as interviews with the teachers. In practice I turned out to do observations for two and half months from late August 2015 to mid-November 2015 during the two introduction days and all the coursework in Module 1: lectures, field trips, laboratory work, students' group work and presentations. In this period, I also participated in a lot of social and practical activities which were mostly initiated by the students. However, some activities were also initiated by me (e.g. I invited the students for lunch and cake to celebrate my birthday in October in my apartment). This means that I physically spent most of my waking hours with the students during the observation period. This was mostly in the classroom but also outside the classroom: in the reading room, in the dining hall, laboratories at other campuses, in several different sampling sites for their fieldwork, the badminton field near campus, in their dormitory rooms, in my kitchen or living room, restaurants, cafés, museums, different means of transportation, in the bank, supermarkets, etc. I literally followed the students around most places, or sometimes they would come by my place if I invited them over for dinner or cake.

The activities initiated by me were gestures to create a room where I sought to get more equal relations with the students. That is to return the gesture that they often invited me to join them for dinner. For those activities, I became even more accepted and included by the students as they saw my efforts to cook or bake for them as highly valued and 'friendly'. It was also because the activities at my place had a sense of home which they had expressed that they were longing for. The insight I gained from those activities will be discussed later in this chapter under the description of the field role as 'big sister'. During those four months, I met the challenges pertaining to a known classical methodological problem of mastering the closeness and distance (Alvesson,

2003; Prieur, 2002). This can be related to the different participant positions I took and was also given in the field and among its participants. Those different positions which I and the participants took shifted and gave me insight into the education as an institutional field, the actors' positioning among themselves and their relationships, thus the important knowledge about the question of subjectivity.

In the classroom, I had the strategy of staying in the background in order to disturb the lectures and some exercises as little as possible. However, I was sometimes included in the lecture by the teacher asking me something. Other times, one or several students would try to establish eye contact in several situations where they needed the sympathy of someone considered an 'outsider'. It was when they felt that the situation was too tough, e.g. the announced deadline for an assignment seemed too short or the reading was too much. I would look back at them with an acknowledging nod. Situations like this show different things: Certain students saw me as a temporal-spatial refuge, in which they would seek sympathy for their struggles in affective moments and a way to confirm the way they took up the different positioning possibilities. Also, not all students sought my attention, and I started to notice that and wrote that in my notes. It was mostly female students who tried to establish eye contact. It also shows that the classroom is an *affective space*, which provided different affective student positions with me partaking in confirming those positions. The affective space is in this dissertation understood as a space in which certain affects are produced. Those 'obvious' affective positions were more frequently taken up by female students (this will be explored further in the emotionality paper (Paper 3)). I also reflected upon the situations as to what students were more or less prone to seeking contact with me, as part of how they felt more or less confident both in the interviews and the informal talks. It seemed that student with whom I felt a solid connection through how they willingly shared their thoughts were those female students who sought my eyes in the classroom, especially when they felt affectively stressed. I will describe later how I reacted on these reflections (see under the section about 'The gendered body' in this chapter).

Outside the classroom or during the break I participated more actively by asking them questions of what they thought of or how they handled this or that, or what

they were doing on the weekend. Generally, we had many conversations outside the classroom which were much more based on mutual exchanges, feelings and experiences. How I participated in and outside the classroom and the insights that these participations yielded will be described throughout the following sections.

FIELD NOTES AND OTHER FIELD RECORDS

In this section, I will describe how I made the field notes and used them as part of the process of constructing tentative analytical strategies, and how these analytical strategies became disrupted and transformed to other strategies.

My strategies for field note taking were based on an attempt to capture the messiness of interactions in the classroom in a systematical way through the verbatim principle (to record the original language used in the field), expanding the condensed account when I had the chance. This is based on the following methods suggested by Spradley (1980) and Borgnakke (1996). I would take notes in real time in terms of a condensed account of the different situations if I could and tried to expand them after when I came back to my apartment. Even with the recordings of the condensed account, I aimed for the original expression. To record the original expression is the most important rule in recording the observed, as it is the way to capture the actor's and the field's expressions (Borgnakke, 1996). For me, it meant that I was writing in multiple languages, mostly English, but also Mandarin and Danish. However, I did not find it disturbing as I myself switch between the languages. The ability to switch between the languages made it (more) visible for me that sometimes certain students were excluded from the conversation. It was primarily when the Chinese students switched into Mandarin during group work or small talk; then the Danish or international students could not follow. I observed that some students were very direct and interrupted the conversation by asking them to switch back to English, whereas others waited for their chance to tap in again by making a joke or something like that. The Chinese students said that it was just for the sake of convenience and that they felt that they could express themselves more fluently in Mandarin. These observations captured the inclusion and exclusion mechanisms which were at stake as part of the linguistic diversity and

interaction. These are also an interesting aspect of transnational education. However, it was not within the scope of the dissertation as there is already a range of studies which deal with the linguistics in similar contexts (Jenkins, 2014; Perrin, 2017; Turner, 2011). One might argue that the linguistic aspect is also one of the in- and exclusion mechanisms among many. The emotional aspect, for example, is another part of it which I did not expect to 'find'. Hence, it is far more interesting and surprising. These expectations are based on the fact that the existing research literature about transnational education does not touch upon that theme, nor did the pilot interviews which I conducted.

My field notebook was divided into different sections: practical section (for date, place, which lecture), drawing section, the condensed accounts, notes about analytical prospects, notes and reflections about my own participation during the day, etc. The drawing section was a space for drawing a map of where the students were sitting (and how the furniture was arranged) and at the same time capturing which students were present. This also included a new map during the day if they changed seats. The mapping had multiple functions: a practical one and an analytical one. The practical dimension was so I could remember the names of students, as I had an assumption (based on my experiences from other classroom observations) that students are likely to place themselves in the same seat over and over. And this was almost the case here as well. Comparing the mappings of classroom observations from 2.5 months prior, only a few students moved around in the classroom. Particularly one Danish female student was mobile: She could move to different spots without it seeming to be 'disturbing'. And also she was that student who socially was most mobile, meaning that she could basically talk with most of the class, where some other students were only interacting with selected students both in and outside the classroom. This gave me the insight about how the classroom seating is also a big part of how the students socialize with each other in the class and during the break (but also outside the classroom). Analytically, the mapping of seating was also part of the intention of mapping how a more stabilized academic and social positioning becomes established during the systematic observation in the classroom. I wrote down who was attending the class, who was asking questions, who was getting acknowledgment from the teachers, who was talking to whom.

My intention was to explore my observations further/in depth in the interviews by looking for how the students saw themselves/their positions in contrast to what I observed. Having different sections was based on an ideal of differentiating between the observed and the interpretation of the observation. This is argued by ethnographers (e.g. Borgnakke, 1996; Spradley, 1980) as a way to capture the categories made in the field through verbatim recordings of as much as possible in the original language. However, that became difficult to practice, as things were often going very fast, making it impossible to write both the interactions and my thoughts about them. Throughout the observations, my own thoughts took less and less space in the condensed recordings. My strategy for the recordings changed to 'sticking to' the original expression instead of managing both. It was an attempt 'to sustain' the object without objectifying it (Hastrup, 1988). However, the basic condition for research is that there is always a latent interpretation, as an objectification of the situation is happening from every subject position (Ambrosius Madsen, 2003; Hastrup, 2003).

I tried to incorporate that fundamental premise of latent objectification and interpretation when I was writing the expanded recording in the evenings. In a separate section, I wrote my reflections about how my lenses were colored in the concrete situation, which enabled me to read the situation the way I did. This also includes how my body was read by the students in certain situations and how my presence might have influenced the situation. In other words, I was writing about the beginning thoughts of the subject positions which were possible for me to take in the field. These issues will be explored further in the sections where I discuss the different field roles I 'took'.

THE ANALYTICAL SHIFTS DURING THE OBSERVATIONS

After one month of observing the lectures, it became clear that it was quite difficult for me to point out a stabilized academic positioning for several reasons.

It became really obvious that it was hard for me to assess how the students were doing academically, as the things they worked on within the lectures were far from my own field. I could see who was active and asking questions during the lectures, hence also which students were seeking the teacher's attention and

performing as the 'good' student, engaged and paying attention. The definition of being a good student is based on the teachers' and students' interviews. In the teachers' interviews, I was trying to ask what the teacher was thinking of the students and their academic performance and if they could think/give an example of a good student. However, a good student did not necessarily align with what according to the teacher was a student who was performing well academically speaking. As I became aware of this, those students I registered as those who were often posing questions were not always the same students whom the teacher would point to when they were talking about students with a good academic performance. I was curious about that and asked the teachers specifically about those students who seemed engaged and often posed questions during the lecture. Most of the teachers told me that they could see the engagement from the student's side. However, it was not always highly 'qualifying' questions they would ask. The teacher acknowledged the situation as acceptable and argued that this was caused by the class consisting of students with mixed academic backgrounds, as the program is interdisciplinary. Another observation about academic performance: Many of the teachers when starting their first lecture in the program asked the students which academic background they had. Later when I interviewed the teachers at the end of their lectures about whom they assessed as performing well, there was a tendency that teachers pointed to students from their own field as performing academically better than students with different backgrounds. With the program's curriculum, the academic positioning for the students was thus shifting.

It seemed to me that the academic positioning was shifting when the class shifted the content of the program (different sub-module). This was very visible during the time for assignments in the lectures, as students were seeking each other's help. Those students who solved and understood the assignment quickly became the center of attention from other students as they seemed to be framed as 'experts'. Even with the teacher's presence, the students sought 'the expert' first. And who became the center would shift with the content. This gave me insight into the social interaction dynamics as not visibly competitive in the class: Seeking each other's help so obviously became a normal practice when they were asked to do assignments. In these situations, the students seemed to acknowledge and value different students' expertise and help. The students did not seem to be embarrassed by the fact that they did not understand the problem.

In that way, the position as the best academic was circulating among the students. However, the circulation of the position as an expert was often occurring among the same eight students.

With this insight, I adjusted and shifted my analytical perspective to ask: Which other kinds of positioning were also circulating? And how was this connected to the students' thinking of the ideal of being an academic? Which aspects of the social as perceived by the students (nationality, language, academic schooling, interest, gender) might mean something significant for the interaction in the class? The first shift is especially about how the aspect of nationality is related to good scientific practice, which comes structure their ideal of being a good academic. This is explored further in depth in Paper 2: "Transformations of Chinese and Danish students' perceptions of the significance of culture in transnational education in China". The paper explores how students have described national culture as significant for their interactions and their opportunity to achieve academically at the beginning of their study. The paper is written early in the dissertation processes mainly based on the pilot interviews I had done and was submitted to a journal before the fieldwork. However, during the review processes (which lasted long after I had ended the fieldwork) I had the chance to think with the observations and incorporate some elements from the analytical perspectives which were made in the course of this fieldwork.

Another shift in the analytical focus was a couple of weeks later into the program when the tight schedule in the program and the stress of exams were approaching. I observed how the classroom itself became a very 'tense' affective space. It was through how students were verbally expressing their sense of hopelessness of making the deadlines and handing in some assignment which they were worried might fail. This includes that these ventilations of hopelessness, for instance, became visible in how their body language was functioning: For example, they would sigh when they showed up in the morning or if someone mentioned the word "deadline" or "assignment", or if a student let out a very fake laugh. This became almost a ritual for the students. While I was in the field I did not think about the emotion as circulating the way I did theoretically in the later analytical work. However, in my observations the students were often 'moody' and the jokes were no longer cheerful but rather close to tearful. There were small jokes which were funny and had a sense of melancholy, for example when students were sitting in small groups doing a

programming assignment after ending the lectures. When something did not work out on one laptop, the male student would start a joke about how he would kill himself. After which a female student said the quickest way is definitely jumping from the roof, and a third female student said that it is actually better if one slits one's wrists. And then people would start to laugh, but the laughs sounded in my ears as more like "okay; let us move on to the programming".

It seems to me that the emotions had become very articulated in the class, so I turned my interest toward talking with them about the emotions and the handling of them in certain 'tense' situations. And during the second round of interviews, I became curious about how especially female students talked about how they were connecting a certain emotional performance with culture and gender. This is illuminated in Paper 3: "How am I supposed to feel? Female students' emotional reasoning about academic becoming in a transnational higher educational context".

Much of the observation time also became part of the confidentiality and familiarity building through just physically being there with them. This entailed talking with them about things which they occupied them. This means that I became familiar with and part of the socialities that emerged in the space. For instance about what can be shared and articulated in the public space and with others (that the students are not good at every subfield they have to study) and what cannot be shared (how they deal with feeling depressed or stressed about learning situations).

My body was also surfaced and shaped by the affective structures like theirs, such as for instance by the strain of sitting and listening to the lectures for so many hours. This gave me some very valuable access in the talks and in the second and third interviews. In these interviews, the students often just referred to different (also affective) situations in their explanations of their experiences which I was part of. It seems to me that a shared experience of the affective space became a catalyst for how the space for the interview was structured. This became part of the confidentiality in the interview situations.

GO-BETWEEN POSITIONS AND OTHER ROLES IN THE FIELD

As described above, the poststructuralist ethnographical methodological understanding of the position of the researcher can be considered as co-producer and not as 'neutral'. And in the Foucauldian perspective, it is less about neutrality than about which subject position is possible both for me (as a researcher) as well as for the students (as the research object). This is aligned with the Foucauldian perspective as power and knowledge can merely be understood as relational (Popkewitz, 2000). In the context of the SDC, my subject position can never be seen as neutral. With my bodily markers, it is quite obvious from my entering the field that I was assigned particular subject positions. This happened through how the field 'read' me through e.g. my language, clothes, the color of my skin and hair, my affiliation with a Danish university, etc. This has colored my 'reading' of particular moments. However, as the social dynamics in the field were in flux, my positions and the roles in relation to it were as well in flux. As described by Krogstrup and Kristiansen (1999), 'taking' the different field roles and field positions can be voluntary or involuntary, as the taking of roles is not always intended. During the fieldwork processes, I have 'taken' and been assigned a variety of roles and positions. It is important to note that the positions I have taken were not fixed and unambiguous. This was depending on to whom I was relating and under which circumstances. Some of the most important roles I took and was given:

- a fellow student
- **a go-between** a person who could mediate between the students and the teachers and two cultures
- an older student/a big sister figure
- **a tutor** a person who represented and facilitated a confidential space

Here I will describe these roles I have taken or been assigned during fieldwork. It includes also how these roles developed over time in relation to what insights these different roles gave. And more importantly, I will discuss what these positions in the field meant for the things I could 'see' and 'find' – how I could make and remake the findings and constructions.

ACCESS TO AND THE FIRST ENCOUNTER WITH THE CLASS

My first meeting with the whole class was on the introduction day on August 31st, 2015. The program for that day was organized by three professors. They introduced the overview and content of the whole Master program and made room for the introduction of students and themselves. I had agreed with the professors that I should introduce myself in the introduction round to the students and ask them whether it was okay with them that I was following the class. The professor made a general introduction to the courses and themselves and also the prospects for the students taking the degree. After that they invited the students to introduce themselves by saying their names, and which university and Bachelor degree they had as well as their expectations of the SDC.

The students seemed a bit shy and excited in their presentations but very aware of each other's backgrounds and interests. Many of them did not say much about their academic expectations but more about the social expectations and their personal interest. They also invited us to contact them if other students had the same interest. It was almost like a speed-dating presentation. In that way the education program was implicitly embedding a presentation performance culture – to make the presentations of the students themselves very short, but still make them interesting to everyone.

When it was my turn, I was as nervous as the students and explained the very basics about my project and that – with their permission – I would like to follow their class without disturbing and also interview those who were interested. And most importantly that they would figure as anonymous in my project and could at any time opt out of if they so desired. Some students were nodding as they understood my presentation. Others seemed to be very nervous about it being their turn next to present. One of the professors took over and asked them whether they thought it was okay that I follow them. Many of the students nodded and said okay, sending me smiles and applauding, which they did after every presentation. I added that if they had questions they could just come and ask. In the break, several students came over and asked me questions about my background and if I could speak Mandarin and how long I would be in their class. Already then, I took the chance and asked some of them for an interview about their thoughts and expectations to the SDC. Everyone I asked said yes. I

made appointments for interviews in the following days. It turned out that some students whom I did not ask in the first place also contacted me and wanted to do the interview as well. They seemed very open and curious about me and my project. And many of the Chinese students were excited about hearing that we could do the interviews in Mandarin if they prefer. I was interpreting that all students wanting to be interviewed was a way of accepting me being in their classroom.

GAINING AND MAINTAINING ACCESS THROUGH THE NATIONALIZED AND LINGUISTIC RESEARCHER BODY

Gaining access which goes beyond the formal access to the class turned out a bit easier than I had expected. Much literature about doing fieldwork describes the processes of gaining access to the social field as the most important indicators for the success of the fieldwork. A lot of the literature describes gaining access as the difficulties of encountering the field and as more than just gaining access in the formal sense (Wacquant, 2011).

Wacquant describes the process of gaining access to the field as *becoming one of them* as a legitimate participant. In this process, the researcher seeks to gain the same kind of habitus as the participant in order to be fully trusted and able to understand the participant fully in depth (Wacquant, 2011). I was very lucky that the timing for entering the field was good, as one might argue that the field habitus for the students at that particular moment was under transformation and adjustment. Furthermore, I had already 'earned the field habitus' through my experiences as a student both in Chinese and Danish university contexts: I did not have to become one of them because I already was. Although I am a student from the humanities and not from the natural sciences I experienced that the students met me as their equal new fellow student in many ways. Just like all their other new fellow students, they treated me with same openness and warmth and for some with big curiosity while others had a more shy approach. For example, I was asked the same questions about where I came from and my leisure-time interests and whether I knew Beijing already. Every morning I was met with smiles and greetings, and in the break, I was never alone but was always 'invited' to the conversations they might have. In the lunch break, I was often invited or I invited myself to go and eat with them in

the dining hall. And for other social activities, I did not experience that they forgot to invite me, not once during my stay. I experienced that I was *one of them* from the very beginning. This may partly also be because they saw me as very similar to themselves. I am around the same age (late twenties), having almost the same life situation, I am still a student, also here at the SDC to learn, not married and not having any children, like to travel, like to cook delicious food, like to be in discussions and curious about many things. This displays that the educational context of the SDC as the social field is inclusive for those young people with a similar life situation and preferences, and that they are recognized as students.

THE GO-BETWEEN POSITION

Being one of them was partly because I could often quickly (trans)relate between what they, in the beginning, saw as two different cultures (Chinese vs. Western). I was translating not only Danish or English words or concepts to Mandarin or the other way around, but also relating them to each other. That role gave me the insight into how students think about national culture and how that changed over time along with my role as partaking in the conversations. In the beginning, the students were very engaged in getting knowledge from each other's previous life contexts. I observed and participated in many conversions about what they see as cultural differences between the local contexts from which they had their social experiences. For example during one of the introduction days of the semester, the students were discussing what to do as a get-together activity as a class. It was because one of the professors said it would be a good idea.

> "We are sitting in the classroom after a lecture just finished, and students are talking in small groups, with people around them, I am listening to a group's conversation in English:
>
> Ren Tian: What about we eat Hotpot, it is a Chinese traditional thing.
> Eva: Hotpot?

> Tingting: Hotpot is my thing because I come from Sichuan, and we are famous for that. But is that a good idea, I don't think foreigners like spicy food?
> Eva: No, actually I really like spicy food, but I also traveled a lot in South America.
> Tingting: Really?
> Ren Tian: I also heard from my friends that some foreigners can eat spicy food.
> Niclas: I am not into spicy food, but I am willing to try it out.
> Hui: I think in Denmark there are many young people who like spicy food, maybe not as spicy hotpot as you can get in Sichuan" (field note, Zhongguangcun Campus 03-09-15).

In this situation, I was in a go-between position. The students seemed to accept that I relate my experience (qua being Chinese) of the concept of Chinese hotpot and its usual spiciness to the Danish populations' handling of spicy food (qua living in Denmark). Like in many other situations, my bodily marked nationality[7] also played a significant role for me gaining and maintaining access. In many ways, the Chinese students did not see me as 'fully Chinese', because most of the time I represented the figure of Danish student, by coming from a Danish university institution and having a higher fluency in English than most Chinese students in the class. Often, I was asked by Chinese students whether I knew this or that Chinese custom, and if I answered affirmatively, they would react with surprise. Other times when they asked me to translate/relate it to Chinese conditions, they just assumed that I had the knowledge of the Chinese conditions. From the Danish and international students' perspective, I was both Chinese and Danish as I shifted between the languages and I also could get around in the Beijing life without help. Sometimes, the international and Danish students somehow ascribed to me a bigger chance to understand the issues in Chinese society by assuming that I knew the history of China. In that way, I was in the students' perspective seen as a kind of go-between figure.

[7] Here I choose to ascribe my bodily appearance to the category of nationality, not understood as which legal national citizenship I hold, but rather as part of the active categorization practice which takes place at the SDC. Mainly, the students would identify themselves and each other through the category of nationality rather than ethnicity.

However, I did not experience that is was disqualifying for participation or getting information. Rather, I sometimes sensed that the students felt a kind of relief that the situation could be translated and felt that what they wanted to express was understood correctly because of my presence. This illustrates that the structure for social interaction between students in the field is filtered through the anxiety of that which is perceived as a language and cultural barrier of communication in the beginning. And this also shows that the tension and concern for getting misunderstood are more exposed in this field. Hence my bodily markers such as age, language and nationality played a big role in my participation in the class. From the teacher's perspective, I experienced that many of them noticed my language skills, and I also sensed that their willingness to invest time in doing interviews with me was partly due to their curiosity about my 'migration history'. They were also interested in the educational and especially the didactical potentials of the aspects I might have caught during my observations because of my language skills.

THE GENDERED BODY

However, I experienced that it was easier for me to be in contact with or be invited by the female students to informal conversations and sharing feelings and opinions (such as being frustrated by the deadlines or missing their home) in the class more than the male students. Somehow, it was easier for me 'to bond' with the female students. With most of the female students, I did not have to make a strategic move to interact with them. They often turned to me and initiated a conversation, whereas for the male students I needed to make the first move before they would engage to talk with me. This displays how this educational field is also a gendered setting based on how one is bodily marked by the category of sex, including me. The contact and connection between students who were bodily marked as the same sex was easier. This became clear to me around mid-October.

In order to create a more equal entry to their thoughts and feelings, I asked the class whether someone wanted to play badminton with me. With the knowledge that one of the Chinese male students was very good at many sports, I was

hoping that he and maybe some other male students would join the team. It turned out that we became a small team with around six to eight students, where four (me, two female Chinese students and the male Chinese student) became the core and the rest would vary depending on the time we were playing. We played badminton once or twice a week for many weeks after that. Even though most of the time we would just be playing badminton I experienced that I was gaining a better contact with those male students who participated. I also got some acknowledgment from them as I was just as good as that male student who was good at many sports. This shows that my body marker as a female in some ways was excluding me from being invited into 'natural' conversations and sharing of thoughts by the Chinese male students. These are some of the reflections on how bodily markers affect access, and how I had to use my not so visible 'marker' to create an equal access among students to achieve insight from a participant perspective.

Besides the physical body markers such as age, nationality and gender, as a PhD student in the pedagogical field I am also discursively embedded in certain power/knowledge relations and ways to produce knowledge within the field. These embeddednesses were guiding my view and my actions as well. For example in those situations where I was assigned a **go-between** position between 'two national cultures', my perspective to read the situation was colored by student expectations for me to fulfill the gap and ease the tension of possibilities of misunderstandings between them. However, I was also colored by my theoretical schooling as I was relating the differences that students framed as cultural differences rather than setting them up as dichotomies. The ways that students ascribed certain meaning to some of my bodily markers can also be read as what the context of the SDC was heralding. It entails that the students also used some of the same criteria to 'read' their new fellow students, e.g. the difference in how I gained and maintained access to female students much more easily than to their male peers.

THE BIG SISTER ROLE AND BEING AN OLDER STUDENT

Besides being a sort of fellow student through which I also sensed the tiredness, stressfulness or joy (and everything in between) on my own body as I quickly

became embedded in their everyday rhythm through my physical presence in and outside the classroom and also in virtual group rooms in WeChat, I also gained the role of a big sister and older student. I was perceived as an older student whom they could ask for advice. I was seen as one who already had been through the processes of obtaining a Master's degree. At the same time, I was also seen as a big sister, as my role also represented a sort of home-ness. The position of exposing the home-ness, which I 'accidentally' took upon me, was created through the events initiated by me as gestures to create an occasion where I sought to get more equal relations with the students, as they often invited me to join them for dinner. But that I invited them into my home was for many of the students seen as a sort of sense of home and an intimate space. The Chinese students expressed that they were far from their hometown and had lived in dormitories and eaten their meals in a big dining hall since they started high school. They expressed their longing for home and homemade food. Even though the Danish and international students had not lived in this kind of condition for such a long time, they themselves also expressed the same longing for home and homemade food. That I was willing to cook for them was seen as a way that I valued them and my time with them. The initiative of inviting the students over for dinner was taken by a male Chinese student. He was asking me whether I was staying on campus or not. When I told him about my shared apartment he happily exclaimed that then we could cook in my kitchen. Then I asked a few more students if they wanted to help me cook. And I got positive responses. Apparently, many of the students shared the same interest as me in cooking.

During the four months of fieldwork I invited the students over sometimes as the whole class, and most of the time all students came, although a few times it was just some of them. We could just fit into my tiny living room when the whole class showed up. At these events, the atmosphere was more relaxed than in the classroom. The students would talk about other things than their studies, and they would ask each other more personal questions such as about each other's family or childhood across the small group they used to be engaged in. At one of the first events, I realized that the students had talked much more with me for example about their background and motivations for their studies at the SDC during the interviews than they had with each other. That made me think that the classroom space was maybe a more individualizing space than I thought (based

on the non-competitive space observed in the beginning). This was something I followed up on in the second and third interviews. And many of the students expressed that they felt alone with the stress. And 'the need' of a space for confidentiality (which the interview space became) can be seen in relation to this. These issues will be discussed further in the section about ethnographic interviews.

Another insight, which these events opened up for, was the students' perspective on each other's thoughts of future places to live and travels and how that might relate to their future careers. These conversations were had in relation to the pictures on my wall of me, my family and friends from different places we had been. Especially the female students talked about what was expected of them as having a career and also as being a wife or a mother in relation to different geographical places. They were comparing and talking about how these expectations might be different considering the different geographical places they could live in in the future. These talks were kind of initiated by the pictures of my recently newborn nephew on my wall. Through this, I got even more curious about their thoughts on future ambitions and mobility especially in relation to imaginaries of places and gender. In the first interview, we had already touched upon the students' reflections regarding their aspirations to realize the transnational mobility potential provided by the program. However, in the second and third interviews, the focus on imaginaries of place and gender as a central theme was added to thoughts of prospective mobilities. The reflections about the issues are explored in depth in Paper 4: "Construction of place-identities and future aspirations for the citizenry in transnational higher education".

ETHNOGRAPHIC INTERVIEWS

The ethnographic interviews are seen as part of the fieldwork and can as such not be regarded as an isolated method. The fieldwork seeks to capture the negotiations, through participant observations in and around classrooms. Thus, the participant observations can give insight into the categories at stake (Gulløv & Højlund, 2003), while the interview is suitable to unfold the multi-faceted and often contrasting articulations of experiences and frames of orientation that are

embedded in the everyday lives of the students. The purpose of the interviews is to produce narratives of the actor's reality and the way she ascribes meaning to reality (Staunæs & Søndergaard, 2005). The plot of a narrative is part of the ways in which the specific subject positions and identities are constructed. Narratives contain suggestions of subject positions, plots and imaginations of the normal and abnormal, which the individual can take upon them and make their own (Staunæs, 2004).

As such, these interviews seek to provide insights into which and how the specific subject positions in relation to knowledge and identities are constructed in the SDC Master program. In order to grasp these positions, I conducted the interviews with the aim of understanding the perspectives of the involved, while later pursuing a more critically distanced perspective (Alvesson, 2003) to identify the subject positions that the perspectives and experiences of the involved exposed. This was done by following an interview guide based on asking descriptive questions (Spradley, 1979) regarding the themes I had observed, for instance, the issues of handling emotions in stressed situations.

The questions were formulated in the language and the categories which I had observed were in use in the field. This was done in order to get close to the students' own descriptions and categorizations. The first interviews were based on the pilot interviews, whereas the second and third rounds of interviews were based on the observations. And it was up to the student to choose which language they preferred to be interviewed in. Most of the interviews were conducted in Mandarin with Chinese students, Danish with Danish students and English with the international students. The chosen interview form was the semi-structured interview in which there is space to both explore the themes, which are structured beforehand, and chase the new themes which come up during the interview (Staunæs & Søndergaard, 2005). However, even though the interviews also followed the new and the unexpected themes brought up by the students, and the students used it as a space for self-reflection, these interviews are different from conversational therapy or conversation among close friends, as they have a specific aim to create wanted knowledge (Kvale, 1996). In this case, it is about the possible subject positions for the students. Hence my role during the interview was to navigate professionally between the attempt to

produce a specific knowledge and to pursue the unexpected which emerged during the interview (Staunæs & Søndergaard, 2005).

Using photos and other materials in the interviews

A couple of days before the second and third rounds of interviews the students were asked to choose a material and bring it to the interview: A material which for them was related to the subject of the interview. And the subject of the interview was how they experienced student life at the SDC. The material is understood as what Taguchi (2012) labels a machine which is an active part of a "knowledge device" (in Swedish: kunskapsapparat). The knowledge device is an abstract machine with a kind of force in itself, something which is dynamic rather than static, and something which can be identified through what it is capable of producing. The assumption was that the students would bring something with them that could generate new knowledge about the study life they were going through in the new educational setting, instead of being just a summary of what the students had experienced. For the second round of interviews, I asked them to bring whatever crossed their mind as a study-related item of importance to them. I experienced that some students understood the task in a way where what they had taken with them created a good foundation for our conversation (see e.g. Paper 3, where a student brought a mask for air pollution protection), whereas other students did not really understand the task, or said it was too abstract for them. So the item only worked for some of the interviews as a 'knowledge device' or an opener for the interview and for them to choose the issues they wanted to talk about. So to make it more specific I asked them to bring photos to the third interview. This was also because I had observed that all of the students, besides one, had a smartphone and took a lot of photos. But in addition, I was inspired by Taguchi's argument that photos as the material can have a generative force. She argues that photography, as it is used in documentation of pedagogical work in preschool and kindergarten in the Nordic countries, is a good example of a knowledge device. As part of the documentation, the photos have no limits as to how they may be related to other things, words and fantasies, etc. In that way, the photos are used to generate new phenomena rather than to capture the things and situations which have already happened. So the material acts as a machine for creating new knowledge rather than rendering what has happened visible (Taguchi, 2012).

In the third interviews, the materials (the photos) that the students brought with them proved very productive. They functioned as a way to point to the things and moments that the students found most central to their experiences of the SDC, and many of them started to talk about their own development. For instance, one female student brought three pictures with her. She said that the pictures depicted important moments of her student life at the SDC: two pictures of relaxation after a long day of group work and one picture of herself, among a big group of students, dressed up very formally for a song competition. When we started to talk about that specific moment of group work, she described how close they had come to each other and how supportive they were under the stressful time pressure. However, she also said that pictures only capture the good moments and neglect the more troubled ones. This was a good point which I tried to remember in interviews with other students too. Here we see that the picture does not only represent something which has happened but becomes part of a narrative into which the student can plot herself. In these interviews, the material was helping both me and the students explore the transformations they were going through. In general, the involvement of pictures also allowed me to explore what students were interested in besides their studies; how these interests were related to the study pressure and how they thought about their identities and future aspirations. For instance, one female student took a picture of a very beautifully arranged omelet, which she had prioritized to cook[8] even though it was a stressful period for her. Showing me that picture she said that cooking is a hobby which can make her less stressed about the studies. However, she also found it important to stress that it was not because she wanted to be a housewife in the future, who is good at cooking and only has a less demanding job in a small city. These conversations which sometimes were about gender, place and identity became part of the reflections about the issues of place-identity (being a housewife as something that apparently related to a demanding job in a small town). These issues are explored in depth in Paper 4: "Construction of place-identities and future aspirations for the citizenry in transnational higher education".

[8] The students are not allowed to cook due to the lack of kitchen facilities in their dormitory. However, many students did cook some simple dish from time to time.

THE CONDUCTED INTERVIEWS

I wanted to interview all the students who volunteered for the first round and then select around 8-10 for the second and third rounds of interviews. The first round went almost as planned, and here I got a good opportunity to introduce myself and my project to them one by one. 19 out of 20 students wanted to be interviewed during the first week of the program. For the second round conducted during the week (November 15th to 21st) after the exam in Module 1, all the students signed up for the interview and I did not want to reject them, so I interviewed them all. The choice of interviewing them all was based on the fact that since it was a new class, I did not wish to create a selection mechanism based on who was 'good enough' for the interviews. For the third round conducted after the Christmas party in the reading/assignment week (December 14th to 17th), I had then decided to include all in the interview, by asking them one by one, as I experienced a greater interest from the students' side for the interview. Four of the students could not attend the interview for different reasons, three of them I interviewed on Skype in January 2016 instead.

As for the teachers I interviewed most of them from Module 1; the few who were only there to give a short lecture I did not interview. The purpose of interviewing the teachers individually was double: Firstly to have the chance to talk to them about my project and assure them that I was not making a quality assessment of their teaching. Secondly, my aim was to capture the institution logic through their descriptions of the program and institution they were teaching in. However, some of the main teachers were also asking about how the students as a group were doing, because they assumed that I had a good sense of this since I was spending so much time with them. When I talked with the teachers about students, I was making general statements such as "I could see how most students were struggling with deadlines". I never mentioned anyone by their name and also emphasized that I was just speaking from my point of view and not representing the students. However, both the students and main teachers 'used' me as a go-between. The students were aware that I was interviewing the teachers, and that I had a 'neutral' position that could point out some things. The teachers, on the other hand, believed me to have a good relationship with the students. I was therefore asked to comfort them by expressing to them that the teachers were listening to their struggles and trying

their best to deal with for instance the workload. And I did both in order to keep my 'trustworthy' positions.

In my analytical work, I do not use the teacher interviews directly. During the fieldwork, I saw how many teachers were coming and going during those two and half months, and during their interviews, I experienced that it was actually hard for the teachers to give a 'stable' description of the program and students as they were only there for a short period of time. However, even though I do not use the teacher interviews directly they gave me the opportunity to have the 'go-between' positions which gave me insight into the institutional conditions of student-teacher interactions and the institutional logic surrounding the Master program.

BEING A TUTOR AND THE SELF-DEVELOPMENT FACILITATOR ROLE DURING THE INTERVIEWS

I have described how and under what circumstances I 'earned' trust through the go-between and big sister role. I sensed that I was beyond the basic sense of trust argued by Spradley (1979) to be the foundation that allows free flow of information from the interviewed to the interviewer. In this section, I will discuss the role I had during the interview situations, especially in the second and third rounds of interviews, and thereby also how the trust was earned through those situations.

During these interviews, the roles given to and taken by me built upon the roles (go-between and big sister) that I had gained through my participation in the field. During the interviews, I took on the role of tutor and a kind of facilitator in the sense that the students acted with confidentiality sharing their reflections on their own development. The tutor role became visible to me as the students were asking me for study-related advice during these interviews. Questions such as how to deal with issues of group dynamics or how to make their voice and opinions heard were part of the interviews. In those situations, I was replying based on my own experiences as a student, which I considered to be the most trustworthy reply in that position. The tutor and big sister role laid the ground

for the second and third interviews with the students, as it had enabled a space that was intimate enough for them to allow themselves to share their reflections on and their feelings of happiness, stress, disappointment, fear and hope regarding the specific moment in their student life and their future. As I read it, these intimate ways in which the interview took form displayed that many students felt they found a confidential space for self-reflections without being assessed through the certain competition and performance logic embedded in the Master program. Thus, many of the students said that they did not talk about these things with their fellow students. These insights reinforced my tentative thoughts about the SDC space. I had perceived it as quite collectively oriented due to the way they helped each other during the assignments, but now I wondered if it was more individualizing than I first assumed. And also in the second interview, I made the theme of how they handled the stressful pressure with exams and deadlines and the requirements connected with these a topic of conversation. This was done as I sensed – through my observations and through the talks with students – that many of the students were having a minor 'breakdown' because of the high pressure. However, some students were bringing up the subject themselves through the materials they brought. Through these themes, the students made narratives of their tackling of or how they handled hiding emotional 'outbursts'. And in the third interview, we took up these topics again. However, it seems to me that students changed the narrative to a more development-oriented narrative, such as what they had learned through the critical emotional moments. When I was in the field I found it very 'natural' that they could and would expose themselves to me in this way. However, once I was doing the transcriptions of the interviews in Copenhagen a month after having left the SDC, I was quite surprised about their open-hearted reflections; how they were moved or fixed by certain emotions throughout the interview. For example, one student expressed strong emotions (with very wet eyes) as he told me how disappointed he was with the education program and how he felt trapped in it without an exit. Another student talked about the dilemmas she was having about how to be a good fellow student while at the same time not doing all the work in a group; how she had to suppress her feelings of what is fair.

HOW THE POLICY STUDIES COMPLEMENT THE ETHNOGRAPHICAL PART

Hammersley (2006) discusses the consequences of the changes in the spatial and temporal character of ethnographical fieldwork. He argues that many ethnographers within the social sciences (including educational studies) today do not live in the communities of the people they study full-time, and also that the length of the fieldwork is now limited to months rather than years. He raises two important issues connected to these changes: Firstly, due to spatial limitations, we as ethnographers should be careful not to comprehend the actions of people as merely the product of the situation we are studying because we do not have observational material about the rest of their lives. Secondly, keeping the temporal limitations in mind we should be aware of the ahistorical perspective that may be encouraged by the temporal limitations; a perspective which neglects the local and wider history of the institution being studied; just as it neglects the biographies of the participants. The research design of this dissertation seeks to accommodate the spatial and temporal issues. To accommodate the spatial issue, the fieldwork was planned to follow student life both in and outside the classroom. My participation in the field was also maximized, which meant that I literally spent most of my waking hours in the students' company.

For temporal limitations, the dissertation's policy-historical part (Paper 5) seeks to fill out the wider history of the institution, by identifying the kind of reasoning embedded in the articulated need for gaining knowledge from abroad in the Chinese and Danish policies of education abroad. The SDC's emergence may be seen as part of those strategies and therefore embedded in these reasonings. This means that the inclusion of the examination of policies in this dissertation is not an invitation to see the practices of policies and student's educational life as representing two different levels (micro vs. macro). Nor is it an analytical search for the way in which the students on a microlevel manage the policies from the macrolevel. Rather, this dissertation is seen as different layers of (the construction of) the research object in which different aspects of the same phenomena can be illuminated. Furthermore, I am aware that capturing the historical perspective via studies of the policies embedded in the institution is not the same as studying the institution via a longer stay in the field. However,

one might argue that the broader history of the institution can be illuminated through a contextualization of the institution in a historical perspective, as with the dissertation's theoretical framework where the students' subjectivities are perceived as historical positions rather than individual Subjective (with capital S) positions. Within this theoretical grounding, the experiences of the students are seen as possibilities that are enunciated through the historical conditions in which the institution is embedded (Foucault, 2002c). As such, I seek to line up the different aspects from ethnographical and policy-historical studies next to each other as different puzzles that piece together a picture of the lived education life of students in such an institution and the historical contextualization for that institution.

OVERVIEW OF THE EMPIRICAL MATERIALS WHICH FORM THE FOUNDATION OF THE ANALYSIS

This section sums up the different constructed empirical materials upon which this dissertation is based.

Qualitative pilot interviews with 15 students (Danish and Chinese) from different Master programs about their experiences of study challenges during their everyday lives and their aspirations for the future. I conducted the interviews in the summer of 2013 in Beijing and the summer of 2014 in Copenhagen. These interviews were all transcribed word by word with as little punctuation as possible.

Ethnographic interviews with all students in the Master class Science and natural resources. The interviews were conducted in three rounds at three different times: the beginning, the middle and the end of the semester. In total 54 interviews, as some students wanted to do the interviews together, one student did not participate in the first round, and few students were unavailable during the last round, as they were going home earlier for the winter break. I transcribed all the interviews for the first and second rounds and half of the interviews in the third round. The criteria for choosing which interviews should be transcribed were based on listening to all the interviews while thinking of analytical strategies. Those interviews from the last round that I ended up transcribing were those which were exemplary of the analytical findings that

were constructed through listening to interviews and reading the observation notes and reflections. These interviews were also all transcribed word by word with as little punctuation as possible.

Ethnographic interviews with 10 teachers. These interviews have not been transcribed as the interviews are not used directly in the analysis. But as mentioned they were part of forming the analytical shifts during the fieldwork.

Observation notes from the observations in and outside the classroom in the course of two and a half months. These observation notes were written in four physical notebooks. And the reflections of these observations were written on a PC as a weekly logbook.

Policy documents from Denmark and China such as strategies, reports, political speeches, campaign brochures and contracts and bilateral agreements of internationalization in higher education and studying abroad are constructed as the empirical material for the policy study part. All the Danish policy documents are to be found in the Danish government's different public digital archives. The policies in 2007 and 2013 are especially interesting as they explicitly announce studying abroad as a national social matter and as a matter regarding the mass of students. The Chinese policy documents comprise primarily policies of sending students abroad from 1978 to 2016. For those policies that are not made public, the research literature in which they are described is employed. This is particularly those policies from the late 1970s and the 1980s. The later policies may be found in the national legislation digital archive: www.pkulaw.cn or on the Chinese ministry of education's official website. Furthermore, public speeches by four generations of Chinese political leaders since 1978 (Deng Xiaoping, Jiang Zemin, Hu Jintao, Xi Jinping) are included, as these speeches are part of the policy production. The reasoning is often hidden or indirect in Chinese reforms whereas they are more explicit in leaders' speeches. Other speeches such as Reports to the National Congress of the Communist Party of China are also included, and they can be found on CCP's official website.

CHAPTER 5. DISCUSSION OF THE ANALYTICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL FINDINGS ACROSS THE PAPERS: DRAWING THE PICTURE OF THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE STUDENTS' SUBJECTIVITIES ON THE MOVE

Through the papers in this dissertation I have illuminated different facets of the construction process of students' subjectivities in a higher education program based on transnational cooperation between Denmark and China. Furthermore, the policy-historical contextualization of the cooperation has also been shown. In these facets, I have identified the operations of translocal governmentalities as the patterns of rules of reasoning through which students narrate their academic performances. The papers show how the translocal governmentalities are played out through different unequal interlockings of power relations. The different processes of interlocking are taking place through nationalizing, racializing, gendering and aging of the bodies of students which differentiate their opportunities to act and aspire. In this chapter I first want to piece the facets of the translocal governmentalities identified across the papers together. Secondly, I will relate these translocal governmentalities to the formation of the cosmopolitan citizenry. Thirdly, I discuss the analytical and methodological findings across the papers in relation to this dissertation's progression in research processes. The chapter will be structured according to these three themes.

INTERLOCKING POWER RELATIONS: THE UNEQUAL NATIONALIZING, RACIALIZING, GENDERING, AGING

The processes of students' subjectivities in the transnational educational setting are in this dissertation examined as the (possibility of) transformations of their identities in becoming academic and future citizens. This is accomplished through illuminating different facets of the processes of their becoming. The

facet which is explored first in this dissertation is the *changing perceptions of culture* illustrated in Paper 2. The paper shows that the perceptions of 'national cultural diversity' play a vital role in the interactions of students and their interpretation of each other's actions. And also that the transnational space is dynamic, seeing that their perceptions of culture shift during their time at the SDC. They move from understanding their own and each other's practices as tied to different national cultures toward a perception which stresses that their educational practices may rather be understood through differences in national scientific culture. In this sense, there is both a de-nationalizing and a re-nationalizing movement in the students' performance of education. This also entails a hierarchization of the national scientific culture where the imagined Danish way of practicing science becomes the ideal one. Through scrutinizing this process, it becomes visible that the social categorizing practiced through nationalizing (still) plays a central role, as the possible subject positions of the students are produced differently depending on the nationality that marks their bodies.

The facet of the academic becoming explored next in this dissertation is the emotional aspect – illustrated in Paper 3. Through the paper's focus on how female students reason about their emotional (re)actions in the processes of academic becoming I identify that students' affective positions are shaped by unequal interlockings of gendered, aged and racialized hierarchies. The interlockings are processed through the double gestures of marginalizing female students. It is the gesture of the need for empowerment and the gesture of embodiment of the ruling norms of the affective structure for reasoning attached to Western-old-white-masculinity. In this space, the students gain differentiated affective possibilities to act depending on whether their body is surfaced as white-young-female or Chinese-young-female.

Another central facet of the processes of subjectivities in transnational education is the spatial aspect of the identity-making. This is explored in Paper 4, where the focus is on questioning how place and identity in relation to the students' future aspirations are performed in such a context. The performances are examined through the spatial concept of the performativity of scale. It means that the paper sheds light on how different scaled place-identification processes materialize by looking at the ruptures and reiterations of their place-identities.

The scaled practices of place-identity transform and are reiterated differently by the students depending on the interlocking of nationality, gender and age. In this, the future aspirations enacted by Danish male students materialize a transnationally scaled citizenry. The Chinese male students' enactment of the interlocking materializes both a transnationally and a nationally scaled sense of citizenry. However, during the four months their future aspiration changes from a transnational to a national scale. This process also happens for the Danish female students. It means that their imaginaries of future citizenry transform from transnationally to nationally scaled practices. The Chinese female students' future aspirations are transformed from locally scaled to nationally scaled place-identity practices. The nationally scaled practices can be differentiated depending on whether the students rupture or repeat the citational gendered and aged practices of place-identity. This displays that the spatial relations in transnational education function as scaled identity politics which structure the students' aspirations asymmetrically and form their sense of cosmopolitan citizenry in a different way through the diverse ways that nationality, gender and age are interlocked.

BECOMING A PARTICULAR KIND OF COSMOPOLITAN CITIZENRY OF THE FUTURE

Another facet of the student subjectivity studied in this dissertation is their becoming future citizenry, which in this dissertation has been theoretically formulated as viewing them as becoming the cosmopolitan citizens of the future (see Paper 1). In a way, all the abovementioned papers deal with this facet. Theoretically, relying on Popkewitz' conceptualization of *cosmopolitan subjectivities* (Popkewitz, 2000), this dissertation understands the different reasonings (spatial, affective and cultural) as practices governing who the citizen is and should be to 'fit' the images or narratives of the cosmopolitan citizen. And empirically, the papers show that the dynamics of transnationality in this educational space have called for students to reflect on and relate themselves as future citizenry more or less explicitly bound to nation-states. In other words, the papers deal with the limits of the cosmopolitan citizenry as the becoming processes are very much about in- and exclusion mechanisms. This is regardless of whether the citizenry is processed as nationalizing the scientific culture

showed in Paper 2 (where the students become national citizens in the competition) or through the affective processes displayed in Paper 3 (where the female students as racialized-gendered-aged struggle to gain equal opportunities with their white male peers) or by spatializing place-identity as illustrated in Paper 4 (where students gain differentiated opportunities to aspire to a nationally or transnationally scaled future). However, these processes also show that even though students might not always explicitly articulate their reflections on their future citizenry, the category of nationality and race that their bodies are marked with structures their actions and aspirations differently in this transnational context. Thus, it may be argued that this kind of transnational schooling might not foster a nationhood explicitly, but that this kind of educational spaces are particular nationality- and race-sensitive. As such, this kind of transnational education becomes part of the reconstruction of the nation-states as 'the West' and 'the East'.

The analysis of national policy of education abroad in Paper 5 can contextualize these findings. The paper shows that the imaginaries of the nation's future and its citizenry both for China and Denmark are articulated through assumptions of 'the global' and 'global-national relationships'. This entails that the need to have knowledge from abroad becomes essential to the nation-state's survival. In that way, the student who goes abroad (also through transnational cooperation) is acting as a national citizen who gains knowledge from and about the other nation-states in order to serve the nation. These politics of national citizenry somehow are echoed in the spatial power relations in the transnational education space. Another important finding in the policy-historical paper is what kind of knowledge is understood as worthy to import and export by the students acting as carriers in the circulation of knowledge. And also how these valuations of different kinds of knowledge are shifting through time in relation to how the nation-state self-positions in the so-called economic global competition. In the Chinese case, it means that there was an articulated need to import knowledge understood as a natural science in the late 1970s and in the 1980s for the nation to not fall behind even more on the global stage. During the early 21st century, however, the policies shift to include cultural knowledge which China may also contribute to the world since China is now a central player on the global stage. In the Danish case, the first education abroad policies in the 2000s were articulated as a response in order to keep the leading national position among the

rich in the global North. In this, it was no longer only important to export the scientific knowledge but also to promote (Danish) cultural knowledge to the global South of future economic business deals. When the results of this paper are put in the historical light of the relationship between higher education and nation-state formation (shown in Paper 2), it is important to point out that these upcoming citizens' ('self-knowledge') experiences (of inequality and privilege) may play a vital role in the reshaping of the nation-state both in Denmark and in China. We see an articulation of strong Chinese imaginaries that they can also export cultural knowledge, as they now play a central economic role in the so-called global competition. However, the interactions and identity constructions among students in the Sino-Danish classroom show that students marked with Chinese nationality (still) have to embody the rules of reasoning which give the Danish-marked students privilege and precedence. Consequently, I would argue that the forms of cosmopolitan citizenry fashioned in schooling in transnational spaces are nationalized, raced, gendered and aged. These different facets elucidated in the dissertation should not be understood as exhaustive of the processes of student subjectivity in transnational education. Rather, they are seen as some of the vital facets of the students' becoming which I was allowed (through different theoretical concepts) to capture while on the move.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE FINDINGS AND RESEARCH PROGRESS

The first aspect (perception of the significance of culture) explored in this dissertation can be seen as influenced by the studies conducted in the field. These studies have their main focus on the (national) cultural encounters. In the pilot interviews, I was an interviewer with limited prior knowledge about the context of the SDC. This led me to question these processes and also to see them through the issues of perception of culture. Moreover, these were the issues the students brought up as most significant to their studies at the SDC. However, during my fieldwork, I saw that within a short time the aspect of the shifting of perceptions of culture became the backdrop of the transnational space. And other aspects of the transnational space became more present and noticeable for me as a researcher. The national cultural encounter dimension is well-

articulated/problematized both by researchers and practitioners as the issues that students will meet in this context. However, my argument is that the processes of my research progress show that culture perceptions might be the most visible and obvious surface of the power relations in a transnational space, but it is only one part of the subjectivity processes. This becomes analytically identifiable through doing participant observations in the field of transnational space. Here, for instance, I was surprised by the affective dimension as one of the other surfaces which are as important as if not more important than the cultural aspect. This tells us something about the importance of being part of the field through participant observation. Without the observations, the dissertation might only have focused on the culture surface and missed the other surfaces. It also says something about how the researcher's explorative view is structured by the prior work of other researchers in the field. And that interview as the only method may have limited reach to explore the issues that go beyond those that are well-established in the field.

Another component, which also changes during the course of the research progress in this dissertation, is the application of the concept of intersectionality. Throughout the dissertation, a shift in using the different analytical interpretations of the concept of intersectionality can be detected: moving from 'doing intersectionality' at the beginning of the dissertation to using 'interlocking' at the end. Hence the dissertation moves from leaning more on social constructivists' rework of intersectionality, stressing the doings and performances of the actors (Lutz, 2014; Staunæs, 2004), to the origins of the concept of intersectionality understood as how actors are interlocked through power structures (Bilge, 2013; Crenshaw, 1991), i.e. a more structuralizing view of the actor's possibilities. This turn may be identified through the shift in the papers. Paper 1 which was the theoretical framework created prior to the ethnographical fieldwork was more inspired by the 'doings'. The framework was also thought out in light of how to capture the 'doings' of students as participants in the field. Papers 3 and 4 which show the analytical results of the empirical materials from the fieldwork became more and more inspired by the structures of 'doings' and more understood as interlocking during the reworking processes of the analysis.

The further and more reworked the analysis, the more visible the patterns became (such as processes of racialization and gendering). This made me turn back to the original text by Crenshaw (1991) and other black feminists (Bilge, 2013; Collins & Bilge, 2016; Lewis, 2013) that analytically (still) stress the inequality in power structures that structures the actors' doings. And thereby the analytical view of students' possibilities to act during the research processes has also transformed in the dissertation. This has helped me grasp how spatial power relations in transnational education produce the student positions through racializing, gendering, nationalizing and aging hierarchies and inequality. However, in this dissertation, I still work with the Foucauldian reception of power relations. It means that I focus on the relational in power structures that create different opportunities for the actors rather than using intersectionality as a "tool elaborated by less powerful social actors facing multiple minoritizations, in order to confront and combat the interlocking systems of power shaping their lives" (Bilge, 2013, p. 410). In my work here, I have not seen the actors as having a position of being more or less powerful prior to the materialization and embodiment, as I am more interested in the processes of becoming in which the actors gain certain opportunities and positions as an effect of the unequal power relations.

A third element that likewise changed during the research processes is the role of the "comparative approach" in studying these transnational educational processes. At the beginning of my research, I was arguing that this study would seek to go beyond the comparative approach (Paper 1). However, later on, I turned to comparing national policies of study abroad as a way to contextualize the institution in a historical perspective (Paper 5). At the outset of my research, I was more engaged in analyzing the microprocesses of the new kind of transnational education. Thus I aimed to understand these processes beyond the essentializing comparative approach that explains the students' behavior based on their 'national cultural background'. This meant that I was invested in understanding the changing conditions for subjectivity and identity construction. I found, for instance, that students understood the interactions among themselves through the categorization of their practice of science via nationality (Paper 2).

With my awareness of avoiding methodological nationalism, I sought to explore the construction of the national borders of the nation-states through such

microprocesses of transnational education. This was preferred over the assumption of national borders as fixed and already made. However, at the same time, my research interest from the beginning was also colored by assuming that there were pre-existing national borders which could be crossed such as through transnational education. This can, for instance, be seen in my way of approaching the research field of transnational higher education by using understandings such as "students with different national education experiences" in the introduction. It is a methodological paradoxical premise that this dissertation works upon – both in the studies of the microprocesses and the policies. However, I sought to accommodate this paradox in both layers. In the first layer, I aimed to go beyond comparisons of 'national behavior' through analyzing how certain social categorizations are inscribed *empirically* with significance for students' subjectivities. Hence, nationality seems to become one of the structuring categories for the self-perception of the students, but not the only one.

In the second layer of analysis, the methodological paradox was that in order to study the formation of the nation-state (rather than taking it for granted), it became necessary to look at the policies produced by national state institutions. The solution I turned to was to apply an issue-oriented approach (Kubow & Fossum, 2007) in order to compare the national policies of study abroad in Denmark with those of China. The aim was to go beyond the national boundaries in the examination of educational issues and to shed light on the transnational character of educational challenges. In other words, my work turned to a critical opposition to the comparative approach which relies more on *methodological nationalism* than on a comparative approach itself. From this retrospective perspective, the title of the theoretical framework (Paper 1) should rather be "*Beyond a comparative method that relies on methodological nationalism* in the research of education based on transnational cooperation: Leaving the dichotomy between East and West behind" than just "*Beyond comparative methods* in the research of education based on transnational cooperation: Leaving the dichotomy between East and West behind".

CHAPTER 6. CONCLUSION

The dissertation has explored the relationship between transnational higher education, nation-state building and student subjectivity and identity. This means that processes of students' subjectivities in the transnational educational setting have been examined as the (possibility of) transformations of their identities with regard to becoming academic and future citizens. I have examined how students transform their ideas of and feelings about their future and their sense of national citizenry and belonging in a transnational educational space. That is a space consisting of a mix of teachers and students with different nationalities and national education experiences and with curricula which are not only bound to one nation-state's ideal of citizenry. The exploration has been conducted through two related layers. One layer being the concrete microprocesses of the lived education life of the students in a transnational higher education institution. The other layer being a historical contextualization of education policies concerning 'to study abroad' in the two nation-states involved in the studied transnational higher education institution: Denmark and People's Republic of China.

The main research questions which have guided the two layers are: *What possibilities for constructing subjectivities and ideals of citizenry appear when students with different national educational experiences meet in a new educational context built on transnational cooperation? And how can we historically understand the emergence of this new education cooperation as part of nation-state building?* This study is based on the following empirical materials: pilot interviews with students at the Sino-Danish University Center (SDC), an ethnographical study at the SDC in Beijing for four months and a policy-historical study that contextualizes the emergence of the SDC.

The analysis has shown that the students' subject possibilities and positions are fashioned by the negotiations and transformations of imaginaries and emotions. In these imaginaries and emotions, specific intersections of nationality, race, age, and gender are linked to their educational performances and encounters with each other. The explored aspects of subjectivity and future citizenry are the changing perceptions of significant national cultural practices in education, the students' reasoning about their emotional (re)actions, the students' performances

of place-identities in a scaled practice and the historical emergence of this new education cooperation as part of nation-state building. The analytical findings across the papers in this dissertation (the different spatial, affective and cultural reasonings) show how the processes of subjectivity construction are structured. In such a context, the processes of subjectivity construction are played out through different unequal interlockings of power relations. The different processes of interlocking take place through nationalizing, racializing, gendering and aging of the students' bodies. These interlockings differentiate their opportunities to act and aspire. In this dissertation, student subjectivity has been theoretically formulated as seeing them as becoming the cosmopolitan citizens of the future. Theoretically, drawing on Popkewitz' conceptualization of cosmopolitan subjectivities (Popkewitz, 2000), I have understood the different reasoning (spatial, affective and cultural) as practices that govern who the citizen is and should be in order to 'fit' the images of the cosmopolitan citizen. The papers reveal a very important finding, namely that the dynamics of transnationality in this transnational education institution have required students to reflect on and relate themselves as future citizenry more or less explicitly bound to nation-states. In other words, the dissertation points to the limits of the cosmopolitan citizenry as the becoming processes are very much about in- and exclusion structures. These structures are bound to national imaginaries and racial hierarchies which seem to be part of the processes in the transnational educational context. Thus this displays that even though students might not always explicitly articulate their reflections on their future national citizenry, their bodies are marked through the categories of nationality and race. These markings structure the students' actions and aspirations differently in such a transnational context.

I have shown that this kind of transnational education might not nurture nationhood explicitly. However, the transnational educational spaces are particularly nationality- and race-sensitive and thereby become part of rebuilding the nation-states as part of 'the West' and 'the East' respectively. The policy-historical analysis can contextualize the findings regarding the nationality sensitivity, as the politics of national citizenry in the policies are echoed in the spatial power relations in the transnational education space. For both China and Denmark, the politics of national citizenry based on the imaginaries of the nation's future and its citizenry are dependant on 'the global' and the 'global-

national relationship'.This entails that the need to have knowledge from abroad becomes essential to the nation-state's survival. In that way, the student who goes abroad (also through transnational cooperation) is acting as a national citizen who gains knowledge from and about the other nation-states to serve the nation.

However, the nationality and race sensitivity are in transnational educational institutions interlocked with gender and age. The analytical findings point out that the possibilities to aspire to a certain scaled place-identity or to be surfaced with certain emotions for female and male students are differently produced in such a transnational context. And furthermore, the students' position to imagine their future is also structured by how their age is gendered and nationalized. Consequently, the dissertation shows that the forms of cosmopolitan citizenry fashioned in a transnational educational institution are nationalized, raced/racialized, gendered and aged.

EPILOG: FUTURE RESEARCH TRAJECTORIES

This section discusses three themes that the findings of the dissertation concerning global inequality (re)produced in the transnational classroom make visible and thus open for further exploration. These are the aspects of class, race and history of transnational education migration. The discussion also serves as a way for me to think about possible prospective research questions concerning the relation between the construction of students' subjectivities, transnational education and nation-state building.

CLASS – IN DIALOGUE WITH THE BOURDIEU-INSPIRED STUDIES

The aspect of class was not in focus in this dissertation. However, that does not mean that the analytical findings cannot be understood in relation to this social category. In line with the studies which have explored the earlier generation of transnational education (Holloway et al., 2012; Waters, 2012), the dissertation shows that the third generation of transnational education produces structural inequalities and unequal social relations (along the lines of class, age, gender, etc.) transnationally. As described in the state-of-the-art chapter (Chapter 2), there is an increasing stratification on a transnational scale, as educational mobility exacerbates structural inequalities and unequal social relations (along the lines of class, age, gender, etc.) across sending and receiving communities (Holloway et al., 2012; Waters, 2012). This has by some scholars been analyzed by applying for instance Pierre Bourdieu's work. They examine 'cosmopolitanism' as a new element of cultural capital, a space of struggles for future dominant positions in a global world (Blanck & Börjesson, 2014; J. Kim, 2011; Weenink, 2008). Some researchers, including Igarashi and Saito (2014), have argued that the highest standards of academic excellence and to confer academic qualifications as cultural capital to prevail in a global world are still commonly seen as embodied in the higher education institutions of North America and Western Europe (Igarashi & Saito, 2014). This means that for

institutions such as the SDC it might be easier for students who grew up in Western countries to acquire cosmopolitanism as part of their cultural capital because the academic qualifications that are only local or national to them are simultaneously regarded as global. Given these findings, one can argue that it will be even more interesting to explore in depth how social class in the third generation of transnational education institution is (re)produced. It might require a nuanced sensitivity to grasp the materialization of cosmopolitan cultural capital more specifically to explore the valuation of the students' disposition in the educational institutions. Because the students have mixed nationalities and curricula, based on negotiations of cross-national institutions, there is a need to explore how the habitus of the students have been formed in the different national education fields. The recognition of different types of symbolic and material resources might be different in the different national fields (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 2007). Thus, we must capture analytically how 'class background' as habitus (the embodied state of cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1986)) plays into students' subjectivity (including how class intersects with nationality, gender and age). We have to question the comparability of the national educational fields in which the students' habitus were formed. Even though many of the students regardless of nationality are first-generation academics, the very different historical developments of socio-economic stratification in the context of e.g. Denmark and China point to the need for a historical analysis of the mechanism of an educational institution in the production of social (im)mobility. This is in order to understand the national, social, economic and cultural capital that forms the disposition of students. In this way, the exploration of class could create a foundation for understanding which student habitus become recognizable in the transnational educational context, and how these habitus might be transformed in the transnational setting.

In other words, it might be interesting to discuss the results of this dissertation in relation to an analysis of the different national fields of power which are at stake in order to comprehend the dispositions of the students. This includes considering how the particular national fields of power are related to each other in order to grasp why the Danish/Western dispositions appear to be preferable in the transnational classroom when cooperation and exchange are grounded in the idea of equal values.

RACE – IN DIALOGUE WITH CRITICAL RACE THEORY

I have worked with social categories in this dissertation through how and when certain social categorizations are employed *empirically*, articulated and inscribed with significance for students' subjectivities. I have explored how gender and age intersect with ethnicity, nationality and race through the categorization practices in the processes of transnational education. This includes showing how the categorization practices differentiate the possible subject positions for the students. At the beginning of the research process, I was engaged in and eager to understand the transnational education processes through how the students might identify themselves and each other through the category of ethnicity. This focus built upon my early research work on education processes, student subjectivity and role of being inscribed as 'the ethnic other' in a Danish context (J. H. Li, 2011). At the beginning of the dissertation, I inherited what Critical Race Theory (CRT) describes as the European research tradition's denial of race (Tomlinson, 2013) in 'the European context' that neglects and rejects race and prefer ethnicity or culture as the categories that matter (Gillborn & Ladson-Billings, 2017). CRT critiques this tradition as being colorblind and misunderstanding the theoretical assumption of race as complex and dynamic social phenomena. Thus, the European research traditions often miss the centrality of systematically studying racialized patterns that structure inequality and exclusion for minoritized groups in a European context (Gillborn & Ladson-Billings, 2017). Studying the excluded and oppressed is also an apparatus to examine the prevailing discourses and imaginaries. It examines the prevalent discourses and imaginaries that form the identities through the promotion of race and culture as totalities that are fixed and unchanging (Balibar, 2009).

My research processes on the one hand reflect the critique. I began my search for the subjectivity processes in transnational education through the categorization of ethnicity. However, on the other hand, I was working with how specific categories were activated empirically. This gave me the opportunity to realize that it was not (so much) the category of ethnicity that was at stake. Rather, nationality and race were structuring the differentiating possibilities of the students' actions in such a transnational context. My analytical findings across the papers in this dissertation show that nationality as a category is

employed (as in the early pilot interviews) by students attending programs at the SDC without the EU students. By contrast, the analysis based on the later ethnographical fieldwork at the SDC where EU students were also attending points to the activation of the categories of Western vs. Chinese. This I read as racialization processes. It displays that a complex and dynamic environment that fosters unequal opportunities for action and identity for students cannot only be read through nationalization processes but must also be considered as racialization processes. This also suggests that the denied and discursive 'inarticulation' of the category of race in 'the European context' becomes activated in transnational education, that is when 'Europeans' (citizens from more than one EU member state) are present and represented through a state institution.

With the dissertation's findings of the spatial place-identity process in transnational education, the European context (and scale) should not only be seen as created upon the physical geographical borders of Europe. It is also constructed in the transnational classroom which is physically placed 'outside' Europe. This points to the prospect of exploring the processes of inequality through racialization and nationalization that happen in transnational education institutions in relation to the debate about Europe's colonial legacy. More precisely, how the colonial legacy might reproduce the unequal structures in which transnational education appears to be embedded.

HISTORY – IN DIALOGUE WITH THE HISTORICIZING EDUCATION MIGRATION IN NATION-STATE BUILDING

Another prospective use of the dissertation's results would be in a discussion of the emergence of institutions like the SDC understood in light of the long history of the phenomena of educational migration as part of nation-building strategies. This can be done by historicizing the different ways that 'studying abroad' became part of the early nation-state building in the involved countries. Although student travels and intellectual migration as individual pursuit date back much longer (Fry, 1984), it is especially in the late 19th century and the early 20th century that education migration became a state strategy with a view to forming the knowledge for the nation-state's future and its citizens. The

comparison of 'early' state missions of education migration in Denmark and China can contextualize and contribute to understanding the recent rise in education migration and cross-national cooperation in higher education. Such a transnational historical perspective could explore education and nation-state building as historically, spatially, socially and transnationally entangled (Sobe, 2013).

This exploration might be conducted by way of different Danish and Chinese cases of education migration, for instance the "Chinese Educational Mission" to the US in the late 19th century (Rhoads, 2011) and in the Danish case nurses' education travels to the US in the establishment of health visitors through the Rockefeller Foundation in Denmark in the early 20th century (Buus, 2008). In both cases, the central rationale seems to have been that the nation-state was in need of the most recent scientific knowledge and technology to build, strengthen and manage the quality of the nation-state's population. The early state-educational missions were strongly influenced by the ascent of a modern understanding of 'science' and how scientific progress could and should be part of nation-state building in order to solve – and thereby also construct – social problems. Hence, the policies and strategies of education migration can be interpreted as a process of educationalization, meaning that it is assumed that social problems can be solved through education (Depaepe & Smeyers, 2008; Tröhler, 2016). The gradual increase of the processes of educationalization has been a central element in the modernization and construction of the newly emerged nation-states since the 19th century in a European context which has spread out worldwide (Depaepe, 2012). That education became framed as a site for ways of shaping solutions to social problems seems also to be the case regarding the state-sponsored student/academic mobility. Education migration can thus be understood as imaginaries of the nation's future, including the requirements of its citizens through the depicted social problems that the nation-state seems to deal with both at present and in future. Therefore it might be fruitful to relate the imaginaries of 'the global' 'the other' and 'their knowledge' in contemporary policies with the early state missions in the late 19th century and the early 20th century. This could enable a discussion of how education migration as a nation-state building strategy might have been stabilized and disrupted over time through certain imaginaries.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ahmed, S. (2014a). Not in the Mood. *New Formations*, *82*(1), 13–28.

Ahmed, S. (2014b). *The Cultural Politics of Emotions*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Alvesson, M. (2003). Methodology for close up studies – struggling with closeness and closure. *Higher Education*, *46*(2), 167–193.

Ambrosius Madsen, U. (2003). *Pædagogisk etnografi : forskning i det pædagogiske praksisfelt [Pedagogical ethnography: Research in the pedagogical field of practice]*. Aarhus: Klim.

Andreasen, K. E., & Ydesen, C. (2016). Transnationale dimensioner i dansk uddannelseshistorie: en historiografisk analyse [Transnational dimensions in Danish education history: A historiographic analysis]. *Uddannelseshistorie*, *50*, 74–88.

Antikainen, A. (2006). In Search of the Nordic Model in Education. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, *50*(3), 229–243.

Apple, M. W. (2010). *Global crises, social justice, and education*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Atkinson, D. (1997). A Critical Approach to Critical Thinking in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, *31*(1), 71–94.

Balibar, E. (2009). Europe as borderland. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, *27*, 190–215.

Ballard, B., & Clanchy, J. (1991). *Teaching students from overseas: a brief guide for lecturers and supervisors*. Melbourne: Longman Cheshire.

Bereday, G. Z. F. (1964). *Comparative method in education*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Biggs, J. (1996). Western misperceptions of the Confucian-heritage learning culture. In D. Watkins & J. B. Biggs (Eds.), *The Chinese learner : cultural, psychological, and contextual influences* (pp. 45–67). Hong Kong: CERC.

Bilge, S. (2013). Intersectionality undone: Saving Intersectionality from Feminist Intersectionality Studies. *Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race*, *10*(2), 405–424.

Blanck, D., & Börjesson, M. (2014). Transnational Strategies in Higher Education and Cultural Fields: The Case of the United States and Sweden in the 20th Century. *American Studies in Scandinavia*, *40*(1–2), 80–89.

Borgnakke, K. (1996). *Pædagogisk feltforskning og procesanalytisk kortlægning - en forskningsberetning [Educational field research and process analytical mapping – a research report]*. Thesis. Danmarks Universitetsforlag, Denmark.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The Forms of Capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241–260). Westport, Conn: Greenwood Press.

Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. J. D. (2007). *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Brooks, R., & Waters, J. (2011). *Student Mobilities, Migration and the Internationalization of Higher Education*. Basingstoke, GB: Palgrave Macmillan.

Buchardt, M. (2006). *Religionsdidaktik [Didactics of Religion]*. Copenhagen: Gyldendal.

Buchardt, M. (2014). *Pedagogized Muslimness: Religion and Culture as Identity Politics in the Classroom*. Waxmann Verlag GmbH.

Buchardt, M., & Du, X. (2018). Lutheranism and Confucianism between National Education and Globalization: A Theoretical Discussion. In X. Du, F. Dervin, & H. Liu (Eds.), *Nordic-Chinese Intersections in Education*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Buchardt, M., Markkola, P., & Valtonen, H. (2013). Education and the making of the Nordic welfare states: Introduction. In M. Buchardt, P. Markkola, & H. Valtonen (Eds.), *Education, state and citizenship* (pp. 7–30). Helsinki : Nordic Centre of Excellence NordWel.

Burawoy, M., Blum, J. A., George, S., Gille, Z., Gowan, T., Haney, L., & Lopez, S. H. (2000). *Global Ethnography: Forces, Connections and Imaginations in a Postmodern World*. University of California Press.

Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies that matter: On the discursive limits of "sex."* New York: Routledge.

Buus, H. (2008). *Indretning og efterretning, Rockefeller Foundations indflydelse på den danske velfærdsstat 1920–1970 [Organization and Intelligence: The influence of the Rockefeller Foundation on the Danish welfare state 1920–1970]*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum.

Börjesson, M. (2005). Transnationella utbildningsstrategier vid svenska lärosäten och bland svenska studenter i Paris och New York [Transnational Strategies in Swedish Higher Education and among Swedish Students in Paris and New York]. Pedagogiska institutionen och SEC/ILU, Uppsala universitet.

Cao, C. (2008). China' brain drain at the high end. *Asian Population Studies*, *4*(3), 331–345.

Carson, J. (1992). Becoming biliterate: First language influences. *Journal of Second Writing*, *1*, 37–60.

Chan, C. (2010). Classroom Innovation for the Chinese Learner: Transcending Dichotomies and Transforming Pedagogy. In C. K. K. Chan & N. Rao (Eds.) (Vol. 25, pp. 169–210). Springer Netherlands.

Chan, S. (1999). The Chinese learner – a question of style. *Education + Training*, *41*(6/7), 294–305.

Chen, J. (1990). *Confucius as a teacher: philosophy of Confucius with special reference to its educational implications*. Beijing: Foreign Languages Press.

Chen, Q. (2014). *Globalization and transnational academic mobility: The experiences of Chinese academic returnees*. Singapore: Springer.

Chen, Q. (2017). *Globalization and Transnational Academic Mobility*. Singapore: Springer.

Cheng, Y. (2014). Time protagonists: student migrants, practices of time and cultural construction of the Singapore-educated person. *Social & Cultural Geography*, *15*(4), 385–405.

Chouliaraki, L. (2000). "Universalitetens kontingens" : nogle tanker om diskurs og kritisk realisme. ["The contingency of universality": some thoughts on discourse and critical realism]. *GRUS*, *61*(88), 110–118.

Christensen, I. L., & Ydesen, C. (2015). Routes of Knowledge: Toward a Methodological Framework for Tracing the Historical Impact of International Organizations. *European Education*, *47*(3), 274–288.

Clark, R., & Gieve, S. N. (2006). On the Discursive Construction of 'The Chinese Learner.' *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *19*(1), 54–73.

Collins, P. H., & Bilge, S. (2016). *Intersectionality*. Cambridge: Polity.

Coverdale-Jones, T. (2006). Afterword: The Chinese Learner in Perspective. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *19*(1), 148–153.

Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, *43*, 1241–1299.

Dale, R. (2003). Globalization: a new world for comparative education? In J. Schriewer (Ed.), *Discourse formation in comparative education* (pp. 87–109). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

D'Aoust, A.-M. (2014). Ties that Bind? Engaging Emotions, Governmentality and Neoliberalism: Introduction to the Special Issue. *Global Society*, *28*(3), 267–276.

Davies, B., & Harré, R. (1990). Positioning : The Discursive Production of Selves. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, *20*, 43–6.

Delamont, S. (2009). The only honest thing: autoethnography, reflexivity and small crises in fieldwork. *Ethnography and Education*, *4*(1), 51–63.

Delamont, S., & Atkinson, P. (1995). Fighting familiarity: essays on education and ethnography. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Depaepe, M. (2012). Educationalisation:: A Key Concept in Understanding the Basic Processes in the History of Western Education. In *Between Educationalization and Appropriation: Selected Writings on the History of Modern Educational Systems* (pp. 121–138). Minderbroedersstraat, Leuven

(Belgium): Leuven University Press.
Depaepe, M., & Smeyers, P. (2008). Educationalization as an ongoing modernization process. *Educational Theory*, *58*(4), 379–389.
Ehn, B., Löfgren, O., & Wilk, R. R. (2016). *Exploring everyday life : strategies for ethnography and cultural analysis*. Lanham, Marylan : Rowman & Littlefield.
Engberg, D., Glover, G., Rumbley, L. E., & Altbach, P. G. (2014). *The Rationale for Sponsoring Students to Undertake International Study: An Assessment of National Student Mobility Scholarship Programmes*. British Council and German Academic Exchange Service.
Fahey, J., & Kenway, J. (2010). International academic mobility: problematic and possible paradigms. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, *31*(5), 563–575.
Faist, T., Fauser, M., & Reisenauer, E. (2013). *Transnational migration*. Cambridge, UK Malden, MA: Polity Press.
Foucault, M. (1980). Two Lectures. In C. Gordon (Ed.), *Power/knowledge – selected interviews and other writings 1972-1977 – Michel Foucault*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
Foucault, M. (1990). *The use of pleasure*. New York : Vintage Books.
Foucault, M. (2002a). Governmentality. In J. D. Faubion (Ed.), *Power - Essential works of Foucault 1984-1989 - volume 3* (pp. 201–222). London: Penguin Books.
Foucault, M. (2002b). *Overvågning og straf, fængslets fødsel [Discipline and punish. The birth of the prison]*. Frederiksberg: Det lille Forlag.
Foucault, M. (2002c). The subject and power. In J. D. Faubion (Ed.), *Power - Essential works of Foucault 1984-1989 - volume 3* (pp. 326–348). London: Penguin Books.
Foucault, M. (2008). *The archaeology of knowledge*. London & New York: Routledge Classics.
Gillborn, D., & Ladson-Billings, G. (2017). Critical Race Theory, Europa og pædagogik og uddannelse [Critical Race Theory, Europe and pedagogy and education]. *Dansk Pædagogisk Tidsskrift*, (3), 27–36.
Gordon, T., Holland, J., & Lahelma, E. (2001). Ethnographic Research in Educational Settings. In P. Atkinson, A. Coffey, S. Delamont, J. Lofland, & L. Lofland (Eds.), *Handbook of Ethnography*. SAGE Publications Ltd.
Green, A., Preston, J., & Janmaat, J. G. (2006). *Education, equality and social cohesion: A comparative analysis*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
Gregson, N., & Rose, G. (2000). Taking Butler Elsewhere: Performativities, Spatialities and Subjectivities. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, *18*(4), 433–452.
Grimshaw, T. (2007). Problematizing the construct of 'the Chinese learner': insights

from ethnographic research. *Educational Studies*, *33*(3), 299–311.

Gu, Q. (2015). An emotional journey of identity change and transformation: The impact of study-abroad experience on the lives and careers of Chinese students and returnees. *Learning and Teaching*, *8*(3), 60–81.

Gu, Q., & Schweisfurth, M. (2006). Who Adapts? Beyond Cultural Models of 'the' Chinese Learner. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *19*(1), 74–89.

Gu, Q., & Schweisfurth, M. (2015). Transnational connections, competences and identities: Experiences of Chinese international students after their return "home." *British Educational Research Journal*, *41*(6), 947–970.

Gulløv, E., & Højlund, S. (2003). *Feltarbejde blandt børn: Metodologi og etik i etnografisk børneforskning [Fieldwork among children: Methodology and ethics in ethnographic children's research]*. Copenhagen: Gyldendal.

Gulløv, E., & Højlund, S. (2005). Materialitetens pædagogiske kraft [The pedagocial power of materiality]. In K. Larsen (Ed.), *Arkitektur, krop og læring [Architecture, body and learning]* (pp. 21–44). Gylling: Hans Reitzels Forlag.

Hammersley, M. (2006). Ethnography: problems and prospects. *Ethnography and Education*, *1*(1), 3–14.

Hammond, Scott & Gao, H. (2002). Pan Gu's paradigm: Chinese education's return to holistic communication in learning. In X. Lu, W. Jia, & R. Heisey (Eds.), *Chinese Communication Studies: Contexts and Comparisons* (pp. 227–244). Westport, CT: Ablex.

Hastrup, K. (1985). *Etnografisk grundbog. Metoder, teorier, resultater [Handbook of ethnography. Methods, theories, results]*. Copenhagen: Gyldendal.

Hastrup, K. (1988). Sandhed og synlighed. Autenticitetsproblemet i antropologien [Truth and visibility. The problem of authenticity in anthropology]. In K. Hastrup & K. Ramløv (Eds.), *Feltarbejde – oplevelse og metode i etnografien [Fieldwork – experience and method in ethnography]* (pp. 217–225). Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag.

Hastrup, K. (1999). *Viljen til viden: en humanistisk grundbog [The will to knowledge: A humanist textbook]*. Copenhagen: Gyldendal.

Hastrup, K. (2003). Introduktion – den antropologiske videnskab [Introduction – the science of anthropology]. In K. Hastrup (Ed.), *Ind i verden – en grundbog i antropologisk metode [Into the world – a textbook on anthropological method]* (pp. 9–33). Copenhagen: Hans Reitzels Forlag.

Hastrup, K. (2010). Feltarbejde [Fieldwork]. In S. Brinkmann & L. Tanggard (Eds.), *Kvalitative metoder [Qualitative methods]* (pp. 55–80). cop: Hans Reitzels Forlag.

Hayhoe, R. (1992). Universities , Cultural Identity , and Democracy ." Some Canada-China Comparisons. *Interchange*, *23*(1), 165–180.

Hayhoe, R. (2012). Portraits of 21st Century Chinese Universities: In the Move to

Mass Higher Education (pp. 1–18). Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands.

Hofstede, G. (1984). *Culture's consequences : international differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications.

Holloway, S. L., O'Hara, S. L., & Pimlott-Wilson, H. (2012). Educational Mobility and the Gendered Geography of Cultural Capital: The Case of International Student Flows between Central Asia and the UK. *Environment and Planning A*, *44*(9), 2278–2294.

Hu, G. (2002). Potential Cultural Resistance to Pedagogical Imports: The Case of Communicative Language Teaching in China. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *15*(2), 93–105.

Igarashi, H., & Saito, H. (2014). Cosmopolitanism as Cultural Capital: Exploring the Intersection of Globalization, Education and Stratification. *Cultural Sociology*, *8*(3), 222–239.

Järvinen, M., & Mik-Meyer, N. (2005). Indledning: Kvalitative metoder i et interaktionistisk perspektiv [Introduction: Qualitative methods in an interactional perspective]. In M. Järvinen & N. Mik-Meyer (Eds.), *Kvalitative metoder i et interaktionistisk perspektiv : interview, observationer og dokumenter [Qualitative methods in an interactional perspective. Interview, observations and documents]* (pp. 9–26). Copenhagen: Hans Reitzel.

Jenkins, J. (2014). *English as a Lingua Franca in the international university : The politics of academic English language policy*. Oxon, UK: Routledge.

Jin, L., & Cortazzi, M. (2006). Changing Practices in Chinese Cultures of Learning. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *19*(1), 5–20.

Kaiser, R., & Nikiforova, E. (2006). Borderland spaces of identification and dis/location: Multiscalar narratives and enactments of Seto identity and place in the Estonian-Russian borderlands. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *29*(5), 928–958.

Kaiser, R., & Nikiforova, E. (2008). The Performativity of Scale: The Social Construction of Scale Effects in Narva, Estonia. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, *26*(3), 537–562.

Kenway, J., & Fahey, J. (2009). *Globalizing the research imagination*. London: Routledge.

Kenway, J., & Koh, A. (2013). The elite school as "cognitive machine" and "social paradise": Developing transnational capitals for the national "field of power." *Journal of Sociology*, *49*(2–3), 272–290.

Kenway, J., & Youdell, D. (2011). The emotional geographies of education: Beginning a conversation. *Emotion, Space and Society*, *4*(3), 131–136.

Kim, J. (2011). Aspiration for global cultural capital in the stratified realm of global higher education: why do Korean students go to US graduate schools? *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *32*(1), 109–126.

Kim, T. (2009). Shifting patterns of transnational academic mobility: a comparative and historical approach. *Comparative Education*, *45*(3), 387–403.

Knight, J. (2014). Three generations of cross-border higher education: New developments, issues and challenges. In B. Streitwieser (Ed.), *Internationalisation of higher education and global mobility* (pp. 43–58). Didcot: Symposium Books.

Knight, J. (2016). Transnational Education Remodeled. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *20*(1), 34–47.

Kofoed, J. (2003). *Elevpli: inklusion-eksklusionsprocesser blandt børn i skolen [Pupil decorum. Processes of inclusion-exclusion among children in school]*. Institut for Pædagogisk Psykologi, Danmarks Pædagogiske Universitet, Copenhagen.

Kofoed, J. (2007). Tilblivelser i neutralitetszoner [Subject constructions in zones of neutrality]. In G. Alsmark, T. Kallehave, & B. Moldenhawer (Eds.), *Mellan individ och kollektiv [Between individual and collective]* (pp. 281–306). Lund: Makadam.

Kosmützky, A., & Putty, R. (2016). Transcending Borders and Traversing Boundaries: A Systematic Review of the Literature on Transnational, Offshore, Cross-Border, and Borderless Higher Education. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *20*(1), 8–33.

Kristiansen, S., & Krogstrup, H. K. (1999). *Deltagende observation, introduktion til en samfundsvidenskabelig metode [Participant observation: Introduction to a social science method]*. Copenhagen: Hans Reitzel.

Kubow, P. K., & Fossum, P. R. (2007). *Comparative education: Exploring issues in international context*. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Pearson/Merrill/Prentice Hall.

Kvale, S. (1996). *InterViews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. Thousand Oaks London: SAGE.

Larsen, J. E. (2013). Verden i skolen, skolen i verden – Globale perspektiver på uddannelseshistorie [The world in the school, the school in the world – global perspectives on the history of education]. *Årbog Fra Selskabet for Skole- og Uddannelseshistorie*, 9–20.

Leung, M. W. H., & Waters, J. L. (2013). British Degrees Made in Hong Kong: An Enquiry into the Role of Space and Place in Transnational Education. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, *14*(1), 43–53.

Levitt, P., & Schiller, N. G. (2006). Conceptualizing Simultaneity: A Transnational Social Field Perspective on Society1. *International Migration Review*, *38*(3), 1002–1039.

Lewis, G. (2013). Unsafe Travel: Experiencing Intersectionality and Feminist Displacements. *Signs*, *38*(4), 869–892.

Li, J. (2012). Equity, Institutional Change and Civil Society – The Student

Experience in China's Move to Mass Higher Education (Vol. 30, pp. 58–93). Springer Netherlands.

Li, J. H. (2011). *Anderledes hjem, uddannelse og fremtid for etniske minoritetsdrenge? - Et curriculumstudie af subjektiveringsprocesser i relationerne mellem skole, hjem og etnicitet på en efterskole for etniske minoritetsdrenge* [Different homes, education and future for ethnic minority boys? - a curriculum study of subjectivation processes in the relations between school, home and ethnicity at a boarding school for ethnic minority boys]. Master thesis. University of Copenhagen.

Li, J. H. (2016). Students' strategies for position-taking in transnational education. *Praktiske Grunde : Nordisk Tidsskrift for Kultur- og Samfundsvidenskab*, *3–4*, 53–72.

Li, W., Yu, W., Sadowski-Smith, C., & Wang, H. (2015). Intellectual Migration and Brain Circulation:知识移民和智力流动: 概念框架和实证研究. *Journal of Chinese Overseas*, *11*(1), 43–58.

Lutz, H. (2014). Intersectionality's (brilliant) career? How to understand the attraction of the concept? *Working Paper Series*, *1*(1).

Lutz, H., Vivar, M. T. H., & Supik, L. (2011). *Framing intersectionality: Debates on a multi-faceted concept in gender studies*. (H. Lutz, M. T. Herrera Vivar, & L. Supik, Eds.). Farnham: Ashgate.

Ma, Y., & Pan, S. (2015). Chinese Returnees from Overseas Study: An Understanding of Brain Gain and Brain Circulation in the Age of Globalization. *Frontiers of Education in China*, *10*(2), 306–329.

Martinussen, M., & Larsen, K. (2018). Formning gennem ny og gammel arkitektur [Shaping through new and old architecture]. In M. Martinussen & K. Larsen (Eds.), *Materialitet og læring [Materiality and learning]* (pp. 211–237). Copenhagen: Hans Reitzel.

Mok, K. H., & Han, X. (2016). From 'brain drain' to 'brain bridging': transnational higher education development and graduate employment in China. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, *38*(3), 369–389.

Moskal, M., & Schweisfurth, M. (2018). Learning, using and exchanging global competence in the context of international postgraduate mobility. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, *16*(1), 93–105.

Munk, M. D., Foged, M., & Mulvad, A. M. (2011). Familiers kosmopolitiske uddannelsesstrategier – Et spørgsmål om migration og investering i distinktiv kapital [The cosmopolitan education strategies of families – a question of migration and investment in dinstinctive capital]. *Dansk Sociologi*, *22*(3), 31–58.

Ong, A. (1999). *Flexible citizenship : The cultural logics of transnationality*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.

Ong, A., & Collier, S. J. (2005). *Global assemblages : technology, politics, and ethics as anthropological problems*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Oxford, R. (1995). A cross-cultural view of learning styles. *Language Teaching*, *28*, 201–215.

Pan, S.-Y. (2011). Education Abroad, Human Capital Development, and National Competitiveness: China's Brain Gain Strategies. *Frontiers of Education in China*, *6*(1), 106–138.

Perrin, S. (2017). Language Policy and Transnational Education (TNE) Institutions: What Role for What English? BT - English Medium Instruction in Higher Education in Asia-Pacific: From Policy to Pedagogy. In B. Fenton-Smith, P. Humphreys, & I. Walkinshaw (Eds.) (pp. 153–172). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Plum, M. (2010). *Dokumenteret faglighed: Analyser af hvordan pædagogisk faglighed produceres gennem læreplanernes dokumentationsteknologi. [Documented professionalism: Analyses of how pedagogical professionalism is produced through the documentation technology of syllabi]*. Dissertation. University of Copenhagen.

Plum, M. (2014). A ' globalised ' curriculum – international comparative practices and the preschool child as a site of economic optimisation. *Discourse : Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, (September), 37–41.

Popkewitz, T. S. (1997). The production of reason and power: Curriculum history and intellectual traditions. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, *29*(2), 131–164.

Popkewitz, T. S. (1998). *Struggling for the soul: The politics of schooling and the construction of the teacher*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Popkewitz, T. S. (2000). Globalization/Regionalization, Knowledge, and the Educational Practices: Some Notes on Comparative Strategies for Educational Research. In *Educational Knowledge – changing Relationships between the State, Civil Society, and the Educational Community* (pp. 3–27). Ithaca: State University of New York Press.

Popkewitz, T. S. (2007). *Cosmopolitanism and the age of school reform: Science, education, and making society by making the child*. London: Routledge.

Popkewitz, T. S. (2009). Curriculum study, curriculum history, and curriculum theory: the reason of reason. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, *41*(September 2014), 301–319.

Prieur, A. (2002). At sætte sig i en andens sted: en diskussion af nærhed, afstand og feltarbejde [To put oneself in someone else's place: A discussion about intimacy, distance and fieldwork]. In M. H. Jacobsen, S. Kristiansen, & A. Prieur (Eds.), *Liv, fortælling, tekst: strejftog i kvalitativ sociologi [Life, narrative, text: Forays into qualitative sociology]* (pp. 135–156). Aalborg: Aalborg Universitetsforlag.

Raghuram, P. (2013). Theorising the Spaces of Student Migration. *Population, Space and Place*, *19*(2), 138–154.

Rastall, P. (2006). Introduction: The Chinese Learner in Higher Education – Transition and Quality Issues. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *19*(1), 1–4.

Rhoads, E. J. M. (2011). *Stepping Forth into the World: The Chinese Educational Mission to the United States, 1872-81*. Hong Kong University Press.

Rizvi, F. (2005). Rethinking "Brain Drain" in the Era of Globalisation. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, *25*(2), 175–192.

Rizvi, F., & Lingard, B. (2000). Globalization and education: complexities and contigencies. *Educational Theory*, *50*(4), 419–426.

Ross, H., & Lou, J. (2005). "Glocalizing" Chinese Higher Education: Groping for Stones to Cross the River,. *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies*, *12*(1), 227–250.

Rubow, C. (2003). Samtalen. Interviewet som deltagerobservation [The dialogue. The interview as participant observation]. In K. Hastrup (Ed.), *Ind i verden – en grundbog i antropologisk metode [Into the world – a textbook on anthropological method]* (pp. 227–245). Copenhagen: Hans Reitzels Forlag.

Saravanamuthu, K., & Yap, C. (2014). Pedagogy to empower Chinese Learners to adapt to western learning circumstances: A longitudinal case-study. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, *44*(3), 361–384.

Sin, I. L. (2013). Cultural capital and distinction: aspirations of the 'other' foreign student. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *34*(5-06), 848–867.

Singh, M., Kenway, J., & Apple, M. W. (2007). Globalizing Education: Perspectives from Above and Below. In *Globalizing Education: Policies, Pedagogies, & Politics* (pp. 2–29).

Singh, M., & Sproats, E. (2005). Constructing Local/Global Pedagogies: Insights into The Learning Experiences of International Students. *Education and Society*, *23*(19), 43–61.

Sobe, N. W. (2013). Entanglement and transnationalism in the History of American Education. In T. S. Popkewitz (Ed.), *Rethinking the history of education, transnational perspectives on its questions, methods, and knowledge* (pp. 93–108). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Spradley, J. P. (1979). *The ethnographic interview*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Group - Thomson Learning.

Spradley, J. P. (1980). *Participant observation*. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.

Staunæs, D. (2003). Where have all the subjects gone? Bringing together the concepts of intersectionality and subjectification. *NORA - Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research*, *11*(February 2015), 101–110.

Staunæs, D. (2004). *Køn, etnicitet og skoleliv [Gender, ethnicity and school lives]*.

Frederiksberg: Forlaget Samfundslitteratur.

Staunæs, D., & Søndergaard, D. M. (2005). Interview i en tangotid [Interview in a time of tango]. In M. Järvinen & N. Mik-Meyer (Eds.), *Kvalitative metoder i et interaktionistisk perspektiv. Interview, observationer og dokumenter [Qualitative methods in an interactional perspective. Interviews, observations and documents]* (pp. 49–72). Hans Reitzels Forlag.

Taguchi, H. L. (2012). *Pedagogisk dokumentation som aktiv agent: introduktion till intra-aktiv pedagogik [Pedagogical documentation as active agent: Introduction to intra-active pedagogy]*. Malmö: Gleerups.

Tan, O. S., McInerney, D. M., & Liem, G. A. D. (2008). *What the West can learn from the East – Asian Perspectives on the Psychology of Learning and Motivation*. *Research in multicultural education and international perspectives*. Information Age Pub.

Telhaug, A. O., Mediås, O. A., & Aasen, P. (2006). The Nordic Model in Education: Education as part of the political system in the last 50 years. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, *50*(3), 245–283.

Tomlinson, B. (2013). Colonizing intersectionality: replicating racial hierarchy in feminist academic arguments. *Social Identities*, *19*(2), 254–272.

Tröhler, D. (2016). Educationalization of Social Problems and the Educationalization of the Modern World. In *Encyclopedia of Educational Philosophy and Theory* (pp. 1–6). Singapore: Springer Singapore.

Turner, J. (2011). *Language in the academy: cultural reflexivity and intercultural dynamics*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Wacquant, L. (2011). Habitus as Topic and Tool: Reflections on Becoming a Prizefighter. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *8*(1), 81–92.

Wang, C. C., & Greenwood, K. M. (2015). Chinese nursing students' culture-related learning styles and behaviours: A discussion paper. *International Journal of Nursing Sciences*, *2*(3), 253–258.

Waters, J. (2012). Geographies of International Education: Mobilities and the Reproduction of Social (Dis)advantage. *Geography Compass*, *6*(3), 123–136.

Waters, J., Brooks, R., & Pimlott-Wilson, H. (2011). Youthful escapes? British students, overseas education and the pursuit of happiness. *Social & Cultural Geography*, *12*(5), 455–469.

Watkins, D. (2008). Western educational research – a basis for educational reforms in Asia. In O. S. Tan, D. M. McInerney, A. D. Liem, & A. Tan (Eds.), *What the West can learn from the East Asian perspectives on the psychology of learning and motivation* (pp. 59–76). Charlotte, N.C.: Information Age Publishing.

Watkins, D., & Biggs, J. B. (1996). *The Chinese learner : Cultural, psychological, and contextual influences*. Hong Kong: CERC.

Weenink, D. (2008). Cosmopolitanism as a Form of Capital: Parents Preparing their Children for a Globalizing World. *Sociology*, *42*(6), 1089–1106.

Weiss, A. (2005). The Transnationalization of Social Inequality: Conceptualizing Social Positions on a World Scale. *Current Sociology*, *53*(4), 707–728.

Wilkins, S. (2016). Transnational Higher Education in the 21st Century. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *20*(1), 3–7.

Wimmer, A., & Schiller, N. G. (2003). Methodological Nationalism, the Social Sciences, and the Study of Migration: An Essay in Historical Epistemology. *The International Migration Review*, *37*(3), 576–610.

Yan, F. (2010). Tensions within the Changing Chinese Higher Education System and Learning. *Frontiers of Education in China*, *5*(4), 473–476.

Young, M. F. D. (1971). Introduction. In M. F. D. Young (Ed.), *Knowledge and Control* (pp. 1–17). London: Collier-Macmillan.

Zha, Q. (2012). Understanding China's Move to Mass Higher Education from a Policy Perspective. In R. Hayhoe, J. Li, J. Lin, & Q. Zha (Eds.), *Portraits of 21st Century Chinese Universities: In the Move to Mass Higher Education* (pp. 20–57). Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands.

PART 2. PAPERS 1-5.

PAPER 1

Li, J. H. (2018). Beyond the comparative method in the research of education based on transnational cooperation: Leaving the dichotomy between East and West behind. In X. Du, F. Dervin, & H. Liu (Eds.), *Nordic-Chinese Intersections on Education*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Beyond the comparative method in the research of education based on transnational cooperation:

Leaving the dichotomy between East and West behind

Jin Hui Li

Abstract

In studies of students' subjectivities in the transnational educational cooperation between the Nordic states and China (e.g. the Sino-Danish Center) there is a need to explore the processes of subjectification by focusing on how the students' subjectivities are shaped in this educational context rather than to find explanations through comparative methods. The comparative methods give rather simplified answers to the complexities of such an educational space (as in Biggs, 1996; Singh & Sproats, 2004; Watkins, 2008). The approach will merely keep the analytical lenses focused on preserving the dichotomy between the West (represented by the Nordic states) and the East (represented by China). Hence, the aim of this chapter is to create a theoretical framework beyond the comparative approaches (e.g. Bereday, 1964; Green, Preston, & Janmaat, 2006) that enables an illumination of the contextual complexities of educational processes based on transnational cooperation. In this framework, the educational space of transnational cooperation will be viewed as a global assemblage (Ong & Collier, 2005) that provides different subject position opportunities to different students rather than attributing their subjectivities to a certain fixed category such as their nationality. The framework is a refinement of the situated approach (e.g. Clark & Gieve, 2006; Gu & Schweisfurth, 2006). It is work based on bridging the concept of translocal governmentality (Ong, 1999), Popkewitz' deconstruction of the ideal of cosmopolitanism in 20th century schooling (Popkewitz, 2007), and the notion of doing intersectionality (Staunæs, 2003). In this framework the transnational education context will be perceived as a global assemblage in which the translocal governmentality is operating. The framework thus suggests identification of new modes of subject-making through the doings of intersections of social categories and detection of what Popkewitz calls "the limits of the cosmopolitan citizenry" in exploration of subjectification processes in the transnational education setting.

Keywords: Student subjectivity, transnational education, translocal governmentality, cosmopolitanism, East-West dichotomy, global citizenry

Introduction

Transnational higher education cooperation in China has been rising steadily since the government began allowing transnational education programs to be set up in the mid-1980s (Mok, 2012). A new period began in 1995 when the Chinese government allowed the establishment of jointly led universities (He, 2016). Among the countries that China cooperates with are the Nordic countries. As of August 2016, both undergraduate and graduate programs based in China exist, jointly led by higher education institutions in China together with higher education institutions from Sweden, Norway, Finland, and Denmark. Recently, universities in Finland and Denmark have been engaged in creating new collaborative ventures with Chinese universities: the Sino-Danish Center in Beijing (SDC) and the Sino-Finnish Centre at Tongji University in Shanghai (SFC) (Ministry of Education in China, 2016a, 2016b). These institutions are comprised of students and faculties with different national education experiences and practices, primarily from the Nordic countries and China. The sociocultural conditions for education and students' subjectivity in these new kinds of university centers with transnational contexts are unexplored in the research field of education qua the recent emergence of these institutions.

The exploration of transnational processes in education has, so far, been dominated by the comparative approach to educational research. The comparative approach focuses on analyzing the process of transnational or international schooling by finding explanations of the students' behavior and academic achievement through comparisons of different education systems and their representatives (the students) (Bereday, 1964; Dale, 2003; Green et al., 2006; Yan, 2010). This approach is based on the idea of the students as representing a homogeneous national education culture, something which becomes visible in their encounters with an alien system of education. In particular, Asian international students with roots in a Chinese-speaking country have gained a lot attention in English-speaking universities and have been problematized in educational practices as well as in research on international schooling (e.g. Biggs, 1996; Chan, 2010; Watkins, 2008). Attention to this has

been rising as the number of such students enrolled in English speaking-universities has increased significantly in recent years. These students are sometimes constructed as a group labeled “Chinese learners” (Rastall, 2006). The group is often problematized as demonstrating “Chinese behaviours in Western classrooms” (Ibid.). This is articulated as a negative encounter between the pedagogical tradition of Western universities and the Chinese tradition of learning. “Chinese learners” as a group are depicted as being blind in the face of authority, inactive in class, lacking critical thinking skills, and poor at adopting learning strategies (Saravanamuthu & Yap, 2014). Other studies in this field have focused on understanding the problems of the “Chinese learner” through the investigation of the misconceptions Westerners have about Chinese learning styles by highlighting how the Chinese mind functions and why certain styles of learning are preferred by Chinese students (e.g. Biggs, 1996; S. Chan, 1999) and exploring differences between Chinese and Western approaches to teaching and learning (C. Chan, 2010; Hu, 2002). In this framework, a range of assumptions imply that Chinese students as a homogenous group bring their learning practices into the new context unchanged. These studies are being criticized for reproducing stereotypes of the pedagogical subject linked to categories such as “Eastern” and “Western,” as comparative studies rely on dichotomies between Western and Eastern cultures, and thereby neglect the changing conditions for learning (e.g. Coverdale-Jones, 2006; Jin & Cortazzi, 2006).

This chapter’s aim is to create a new framework to explore the changing conditions for learning and socialization in newly established education institutions with transnational contexts. This chapter will therefore argue that institutions such as SDC can be conceptualized as new and emerging transnational educational spaces which differ from the contexts in previous studies. This difference is due to the fact that, at SDC, the national ideas of education may be even more disturbed and transformed since the education programs are no longer controlled by one national state institution. SDC can hence be viewed as an educational context with transnational space. Faist et al. (2013) argue, in their analysis of development in transnational migration flows, that the transnational space consists of “combinations of ties and their contents, positions in networks and organizations, and networks of organizations that can be found in at least two nation-states” (Faist, Fauser, & Reisenauer, 2013, p. 13). The transnational space is a space where new connections and combinations can be made across national borders. The chapter will thus argue that there is a need

to apply a different approach in order to investigate the formation processes of student subjectivity in such a context which goes beyond national borders. This approach seeks to add novel facets to the research field by drawing inspiration from the so-called "situated approach" (e.g. Clark & Gieve, 2006; Gu & Schweisfurth, 2006). In analyzing transnational educational processes the situated approach pursues to understand how students' encounters with different educational practices disrupt and transform students' values and identities rather than search for differences and similarities between them through a static category of nationality. Hence, the focus is on how these encounters produce sociocultural conditions for subjectivity and learning. In order to understand the complexities that occur in this new context, one must examine the process of education in the institutional setting rather than conduct 'traditional' comparisons of differences in national state systems and cultures of education based on dichotomies.

This chapter will therefore create a framework focusing on students' subjectivity through a conceptualization of the context with the situated approach as a point of departure and by viewing the transnational context of schooling as different compared to schooling within national borders. First, it will be discussed from a theoretical perspective – what to assume about institutions with transnational contexts in which the students' subjectivities are formed. Second, how to grasp the subjectivities produced in it. Hence, the chapter will end up with the research questions that it is possible to extrapolate from the framework I suggest. This will be compared to the comparative method.

Cosmopolitan citizenry and the micropolitics of knowledge

When considering questions regarding the production of subjectivities in schooling with a transnational context, one may ask whether this kind of educational practice can fulfill the Enlightenment's ideal of cosmopolitanism's ability to create world citizens (e.g. Heater, 2002; Vertovec, 2002). However, Ong criticizes these positions, arguing that the governing of subjects crossing national spaces is not a realization of the universality of cosmopolitan ideals; rather, the emergent cross-border identities, affiliations, and nationalisms in the so-called "global assemblages" actually demonstrate the limits, not the universality, of cosmopolitan ideals (Ong, 2006a; Ong & Collier, 2005).

Moreover, the new university centers based on transnational cooperation, such as SDC and SFC, can be viewed as sites of "global assemblages" in which it is assumed that these situations are ever-changing and are not attached to a terrain of nation-state (Ong & Collier, 2005). In Popkewitz's view, schooling is an institution where the limits of cosmopolitan ideals can be traced, arguing that schooling is both about fabricating national imaginaries that give cohesion to the idea of national citizenry and the images of cosmopolitan subjectivities (Popkewitz, 2000a). Consequently, following the argument from Popkewitz[1] in connection with Ong's, the question of exploration will be posed differently: Which forms of cosmopolitan citizenry are fabricating in schooling in a transnational space (understood as global assemblages)?

Exploring today's inscriptions of cosmopolitanism in schooling, Popkewitz argues that we have to look at reform which has promoted the reconstruction of the school, the child, and the teacher: "That reconstruction was part of the 19th-century globalization in which the nation-state was formed, and again today with different assemblies and connections about the global citizen and cosmopolitan future" (Popkewitz, 2007, p. 2). The thesis of cosmopolitanism was the Enlightenment's hope for a world citizen whose commitments transcended provincial and local concerns with ideal values about humanity. The universalizing idea of cosmopolitanism was historically attached to projects to create the citizens of a nation-state in the name of cosmopolitan values. Ironically, the idea was to emancipate the individual from local and national attachments in favor of the transcendental values of a unified humanity (Popkewitz, 2007). In terms of schooling, throughout the 19th century to the present, the ideas and aspirations of cosmopolitanism have exercised a powerful grip on pedagogical projects. Cosmopolitanism is "often traced to Northern European and North American Enlightenments, faith in cosmopolitanism is the emancipatory potential of human reason and science" (Popkewitz, 2007, p. xiii). However, it is perhaps less interesting to trace the faith in cosmopolitanism than to study the politics of knowledge that are embedded in the practices of schooling to reflect on the "reason" of cosmopolitanism through its circulation in the 'problems' of current educational reforms (Popkewitz, 2007). The reason

[1] In this, I use the analysis from Popkewitz both historically and analytically, as it is my intention to apply his notion of cosmopolitanism as a critical strategy in order to understand education in transnational space as a kind of reform – from a national to a transnational curriculum.

and rationality of cosmopolitanism were assembled with the notion of agency which enables individuals to affect lives and their communities through reason and science by making life something outside of God's wisdom (Popkewitz, 2007). The theories on which this notion of agency is built envisioned people as self-governing subjects with motives and perceptions to regulate the actions that form the future. The future becomes embedded in problem-solving and concepts of agency and action. Pedagogy becomes a way to cultivate, develop, and enable the reason necessary for human agency and progress. The function of modern schools is therefore to instill cosmopolitan principles of reason in children. The reforms of pedagogy express the principles of the making of the cosmopolitan child, who acts and thinks as a "reasonable person," as a cosmopolitan citizen of the future (Popkewitz, 2007).

Cosmopolitanism implies ideas about liberty and freedom, human agency, reason, and rationality that are linked to the problem of social management of a child so that child can come to be a cosmopolitan citizen of the future. Hence, the cosmopolitan child "is not born but made, and schooling is the central site for this production" (Popkewitz, 2007, p. 3). "The Enlightenment's hope in human reason was to produce a progressive future" (Popkewitz, 2007, p. 13). The historicizing study of schooling is hence a diagnosis of the system of reason as practices of cultural theses that shape the global citizen and the cosmopolitan future. So, study of cosmopolitanism can be viewed as "a strategy to explore historically the intertwining of the problem of social exclusion with the very impulses to include and to "enlighten"" (Popkewitz, 2007, p. xiv). This is to think of cosmopolitanism as a process of abjection, a mode to think about complex assemblies of relations of inclusion and exclusion. The cosmopolitanism of schooling is the same phenomenon as the act of thinking of being cast out, placed in an in-between space, and excluding. These principles of cosmopolitanism hence exemplify the comparative distinction that defined, separated, and rendered abject those groups and individuals that are not "civilized" and therefore not qualified for participation. The governing is not only about imposing transcendental values, but also about qualifying individuals for and excluding them from participation and action (Popkewitz, 2007). The politics of knowledge in the production of the self and the world is brought into focus by cosmopolitanism, with the notion of childhood and family as governing practices. Cosmopolitanism, then, is about constructing cultural ideas about ways of life structured in pedagogy. Discussing cultural theses is then to focus

on how different assemblies of ideas, institutions, and authority relations are linked to order the principles of conduct – the politics of knowledge (Popkewitz, 2007).

This is the analytical strategy used to comprehend "how particular forms of knowledge inscribe power in ways that qualify and disqualify students from action and participation" (Popkewitz, 1998, p. 7). In this sense, power is operating through circulation of knowledge or rules of reason, in which the principles by which individuals can act and participate in the world are created. The way the rules of reason select the 'objects' that contain the issues, problems, and practices of daily life is then how power is exercised (Popkewitz, 2000a). Hence, knowledge is attached to power through "micro processes in which individuals construct their sense of self and their relations to others. Power functions through an individualization that disciplines and produces action rather than merely repressing action" (Popkewitz, 2000a, p. 17). The disciplining is thus never totally forced, as production of knowledge functions through those governing codes which are applied in the micro processes as "reason" and "truth" (Popkewitz, 2000b). The disciplining, regulating, and organizing components of knowledge – as a material practice in which the subject is constituted – are what Foucault called *governmentality*[2] (Foucault, 2002a; Plum, 2010; Popkewitz, 2000a; Popkewitz & Brennan, 1998). Thus, the focus on cosmopolitanism is "its systems of reason in governing who the child is, who the child should be, and who does 'fit' in the images and narratives of that child" (Popkewitz, 2007, p. 4). In other words, exploring the students' subjectivity (by seeing them as becoming the cosmopolitan citizens of the future) in institutions such as SDC can be done through detecting the systems of reason in SDC which govern who the citizen is, who the citizen should be, and who 'fits' in the images and narratives of the citizen.

[2] Foucault argued that we live in the age of a governmentality which was discovered in the 18th century (Foucault, 2002a). Foucault analyzed this shift in his lecture on governmentality in 1978. He demonstrated that government, as a general problem, occurred in the middle of the 16th century. He found it remarkable that "from the middle of the sixteenth century to the end of the eighteenth, there develops and flourishes a notable series of political treaties that are no longer exactly "advice to the prince," … but are instead presented as works on the "art of government"" (Foucault, 2002a, p. 201). The governance of the prince was connected to sovereignty, which operates on a territory, and thus on the subjects who inhabit it. This he called "sovereignty," and the altered kind of governance he called "the art of government."

Exploring the processes of subjectivities through translocal governmentality and intersectionality

Ong takes the notion of governmentality a step further into the studies of subjectivity processes in globalization and develops the notion of *translocal governmentality*. Translocal governmentality refers to new modalities which are emerging in global assemblages (Ong, 1999, p. 6). Translocal governmentality in global assemblages is viewed as "ideas and techniques for acting on the self and for reforming/reengineering the self in order to confront globalized insecurities and challenges" (Ong, 2006a). Translocal governmentality is formed through mutations in citizenship. Analytically, there are two processes that underlie the mutations: "On the one hand, there is the emergence of new political spaces, and on the other, the disentanglement of citizenship components" (Ong, 2005, p. 697). The new political space challenges the notion of citizenship attached to the territory and imagination of a nation-state, as the space is a constant changing landscape shaped by the flows of markets, technologies, and populations. The mutations of citizenship can thus be traced as global movements and their formation of new spaces of entangled possibilities. The site for new political mobilizations and claims is a space of the assemblage, rather than the territory of the nation-state (Ong, 2006b). Systems of translocal governmentality are related to transnational strategies of flexibility as, in an era of globalization, individuals, along with governments, develop a flexible idea of citizenship and sovereignty as strategies to accumulate capital and power (Ong, 1999). In the processes of mutations of citizenship, the rights and protections long associated with citizenship are becoming disarticulated from the state. They are reshaped with elements such as market-based interests, transnational agencies, mobile elites, and marginalized populations (Ong, 2005). The mutations show that citizenship becomes flexible. "Flexible citizenship" refers "to the cultural logics of capitalist accumulation, travel and displacement that induce subjects to respond fluidly and opportunistically to changing political-economic conditions" (Ong, 1999, p. 6). Flexible citizenship is then an effect of translocal governmentality which operates through an ensemble of institutions, such as schools, museums, corporations, and NGOs (Ong, 2006a). Where Ong discusses these processes through the notion of citizenship, I will use the notion of citizenry from Popkewitz in relation to Ong's analysis of flexibility, as

citizenry refers to the sense and ideal of citizenship rather than to the legal components connected with it. Sites like SDC can thus be seen as new spaces of entangled possibilities and actions where the political rationality and cultural mechanisms continue to deploy, discipline, regulate, or civilize subjects on the move (Ong, 1999).

This implies that an analysis of the exercise of power in global assemblages like SDC requires an exploration of the development of how knowledge, as a regime, is evolving – the objectification process of students who have learned to recognize themselves as cosmopolitan citizens of the future under transnational cooperation. Furthermore, the search for the limits of the cosmopolitan ideal in these global assemblages can be traced through the search for which governmental apparatus is functioning in transformations of citizenry as effects of these translocal governmentalities, and how it is doing so. Consequently, the examination of transnational processes in education will be accomplished through the analytical lenses of the transformed cultural logics which play out in the microphysics of students' choice and motivation for and in education (the micropolitics of knowledge in schooling) rather than making comparisons based on the students' nationality.

Knowledge as the rule of reason: Disposing desirable citizenry

Exploring which forms of cosmopolitan citizenry are being created in schooling in a transnational space as a global assemblage is then exploring (using the concept of translocal governmentality) the politics of knowledge. In this sense, searching for the effects of translocal governmentalities is a search for how 'reason' and 'the reasonable person' are produced as power operates through the circulation of knowledge, which is tied to political rationalities in the governing structures of our individuality. Translocal governmentality can then be thought of as power-as-effects, though it is possible to move toward self-governance and act within a more or less open field of possibilities (Popkewitz, 2000a); for Foucault, the operation of power is the "'conduct of conducts' and a management of possibilities" (Foucault, 2002b, p. 341).

In that manner, the approach will search for the structure of reasoning in which students act and participate in the world as 'knowing-being,' which is part of the process of becoming a desirable citizen. The structure of reason as an issue of governing can be found in examinations of curricula in schooling, as curricula

are "historically formed within systems of ideas that inscribe styles of reasoning, standards, and conceptual distinctions in school practices and its subjects" (Popkewitz, 2001, p. 151). So, as subjects of schooling, we are not only learning what to know through learning about things like spelling, science, mathematics, or geography, but also "learning dispositions, awareness, and sensibilities about the world" (Popkewitz, 2001, p. 159). The fabrication of certain dispositions, awareness, and sensibilities are thus inscribed in the rules of reasoning in schooling. In exploring the question of knowledge and reason in schools with transnational spaces, it can also be assumed that the fabrication of certain dispositions, awareness, and sensibilities is not enacted through brute force, but through the rules that organize the symbolic systems by which one (as becoming a citizen) is to understand, organize, and participate in the world (Popkewitz, 2001).

The knowledge of schooling that this approach aims to explore is not the concrete scientific knowledge and skills which students have to pursue to obtain their university degrees, but rather what is required of them to be able to 'receive' the transmitted knowledge of the institution. In other words, the self-knowledge and self-reflection about their learning and socialization processes required of the students to become the ideal cosmopolitan citizens of the future. And especially in connection to schooling in a transnational space, the ways students ascribe this self-knowledge to certain national education traditions and experiences (see e.g. Li, 2016).

Subject positions and intersectionality in governing practices

In this theoretical framework the transnational educational processes at institutions like SDC are thus understood as governing practices. Whereas Popkewitz gives his attention to and uses the part of Foucault's work on governance where knowledge relations are emphasized in forming subjectivities, it is my ambition to develop an approach which goes beyond that particular reception of that relationship and to include a focus on the interactions between students in schooling in a transnational space. Popkewitz's analytical conceptions of power and knowledge are valuable in studying the structures in power-as-effects. However, they are limited when interpreting the embodied interactions of students, as their primary focus is on how subjects are shaped by specific practices of governance. Moreover, they do not discuss the varieties and differentiations in constructing subjectivities in lived life, such as how different

categorizations intersect in different subjects in the processes of subjectification. To capture the multiplicities of the process of subject construction and the effects as the different social categories are embodied at the interactional level we need to add another analytic interpretation of Foucault's notion of subjectivity – one with a focus on power as a relational concept that operates in a field of positions that shapes the subjects (Foucault, 2008). This draws on receptions of Foucault's work studying the objectivizing of subjects, particularly the later part of his work where he sought to study "the way a human being turns him- or herself into a subject. For example, I have chosen the domain of sexuality – how men have learned to recognize themselves as subjects of 'sexuality'" (Foucault, 2002b, p. 326). As for this field's object of study, a similar question could be posed: How students in transnational education contexts have learned to recognize themselves as subjects of 'education,' 'nationality,' and 'future citizenry' or other categorizations. The concept of "doing intersectionality" will be useful here. Doing intersectionality is a social constructionist understanding of Foucault's notion of subjectivity[3] combined with a reworking of the concept of 'intersectionality' by Crenshaw.[4] Doing intersectionality is developed to explore how different social categories intersect in the performative embodiment of the students in the context of schooling (Staunæs, 2003, 2004, 2005). Crenshaw's notion of power is merely about domination and subordination. Staunæs argues that there is a need to relate intersectionality to power in the Foucauldian sense: "It must include thinking in terms of power, but not just power as oppression; rather, it should allow space for reconfiguring power relations in processes of subjectification and in relations between subject positions and intertwined social categories" (Staunæs, 2005, p. 154). In the reworking, Staunæs integrates two approaches that she calls

[3] Staunæs was inspired by that school of Foucault reception which interprets his subject notion with performing, acting, doing, and becoming as vital aspects of subjectivity constitutions (Butler, 1999; Davies, 2000; Søndergaard, 1996) rather than merely organized and structured by power and knowledge relations. In this, she is inscribed, herself, within the tradition of the fields of pedagogy and psychology, particularly in that part where poststructuralist and social constructionist researchers have developed their perspectives on the processes of subjectification in relation to discourse theory. However, they continue the sensitive view of the subjectification processes, "in which people take up, ignore or resist the accessible discourses, make them their own and in this struggle constitute subjectivity" (Staunæs, 2005).

[4] In Crenshaw's framing of the concept of intersectionality, she argues that "[i]ntersectionality is a conceptualization of the problem that attempts to capture both the structural and dynamic consequences of the interaction between two or more axes of subordination" (Crenshaw in Lutz, 2014, p. 3).

majority-inclusive and non-additional (Staunæs, 2004). A majority-inclusive approach is a Foucauldian approach focusing on how someone comes to be un/marked, non/privileged, how these processes are constructed, sustained and disrupted, and how power is part of this (Staunæs 2003, p. 155). The majority-inclusive constitutes "an analytical move away from the exotic spectacle of the Other and towards a way of pointing to the mutual constructions between the discursive constructions of 'Firstness' and 'Otherness'" (Staunæs 2003, p. 103). In such an approach, social categories such as ethnicity and gender are not perceived as exceptional minority problems, and social categories are not the privilege of certain actors but rather categories that are constructed, sustained, and disrupted in relation to one another (Staunæs, 2003, p. 155).

The non-additional approach is, as many feminist critics have suggested, a model which goes beyond the additive models of oppression (e.g. Brah, 1996; Crenshaw, 1991; Razack, 1998). As Staunæs underlines, "[t]hat means not just adding categories but rather looking into how they interlock with one another and the kind of difference a difference makes for the individual and how a space with different categories makes subjective experiences qualitatively different" (Staunæs, 2005). It is about questioning how subjectivities are constructed through the intersections of manifold dimensions. In this perspective social categories are something one does, thinks, and says. Social categories are parts of positions of the subjectivities, and some of the discursive structures through which people find their behavior can be studied as social categories (Staunæs, 2003). Such are the positions in the discourse in which the subject can act and speak. Social categories are structuring principles for the interaction between humans, but, at the same time, also structured by the interaction between humans. Social categories are tools for orientation in which we decode, construct, and position ourselves. They are selection tools which are used to attach, detach, include, and exclude specific subjects (Staunæs, 2004).

Hence, Staunæs advocates for the examination of lived life through the approach of the doing of intersectionality, where the way the categories intermingle, their concrete dominance, and their elaboration must be studied in concrete situations. It is important to point out that categories do not mingle equally. This entails an exploration of the doing of the relation between categories, the outcome of this doing, and the effects of this doing on the various subject positions (Staunæs, 2005). Therefore, she suggests bringing the doing of intersectionality to the

foreground, as social categories do not merely intersect, but also interlock and form new meanings (Staunæs, 2004). In this perspective, the approach requires a focus and sensitivity about "details of how the concrete doings and intermingling of categories work in a specific context – i.e. how … they saturate, tone, overrule, and support one another" (Staunæs, 2005). The social categories are thus not something one bears, but rather they are what one becomes through how one's acts are regulated by power relations (Staunæs, 2003). Seeing social categories in this way is to explore the subject in a more vigorous way, by seeing the subject as 'constructed becoming' in the concrete situation rather than 'essential being' (Staunæs, 2005). What becomes central, then, are the concrete becomings of the subject in specific situations (like the situated approach emphasizes), rather than an inherited social variable which can explain the behavior of the subject (as in the comparative approach). By illuminating these processes, the formation of subjectivity through the new meaning of social categories formed by these interlockings and the visibility of the organizations of social life in schooling (in transnational space) will be elucidated (Staunæs, 2004).

The assumptions for subjectivity in the concept of doing intersectionality are the same as in the situated approach. However, with the notion of 'constructed becoming,' we now have a deeper understanding of the specificities of the processes by which the students become the 'knowing being' in the transnational educational space. Such a theoretical angle enables an explorative curiosity toward the lived life in schooling as a microcosm in which the subject is developing, changing, and forming in specific situations (Staunæs, 2004). In this sense, Foucault's idea of a subject having two meanings in power complexities is modified in Staunæs' interpretation[5] and turned into a two-sided

[5] Staunæs tries to make sense of Foucault's notion of the two meanings the subject has in power complexities by using Davies and Harré's (1990) interpretation of Foucault's (2008) early work in the sixties, such as the idea of subject positions as effects of discursive regularity together with his later ideas of the embodied 'on-going subjugation' in the late seventies (Foucault, 1980, p. 97). By emphasizing the processes that Foucault called "on-going subjugation," Staunæs ties the positions regulated by the discourses and the subjects' embodiments of the positions together. In this Foucault has turned his analytic eye toward the interactional level, as he questions more concretely the processes in subject-making – the processes of how our bodies, gestures, and behaviors are constituted in their material instances. Staunæs argues that in the establishing processes of subjectivity, questions of how bodies, gestures, and behaviors are shaped operate through material instances as social categories (Staunæs, 2003).

view of the human as a doing actor, "as both a subject acting upon contextual conditions and as being subject to, in the sense of being determined by, contextual conditions" (Staunæs, 2003, p. 103).

This means when viewing the interactions of students in schooling in a transnational space, we understand the students as doing actors who are able to negotiate their positions through their methods of performing within the interlocking of social categories. However, these negotiations in the social categorization process should not be understood as the actors being led by their 'own' desire, but instead as historical constructions led by the specificities of translocal governing practices, where the individual's subjectivity can be expressed. The approach works with power relations in the construction of subjectivity in ways where students' subjectivities are governed by the rules of reason (the limits of cosmopolitan citizenry) and at the same time the students' subjectivities are differentiated by how they are 'doing' different categories.

Conclusion

Building on the situated approach in studying education processes in a transnational context as for the cases of the Chinese-Nordic cooperation in higher education, this framework goes beyond the comparative method. It emphasizes the processes of making of the social categories of differentiation and identification for students' subjectivity in schooling rather than trying to understand the behaviors of the students through the social categories and educational traditions (like Western vs. Eastern) that they are ascribed to represent.

The theoretical framework argued for in this chapter is a framework in which the construction of subjectivity in an institution like SDC can on one hand be understood as governed through the dispositions, awareness, and sensibilities by which the students 'tell the truth' about themselves and others, which may be founded on the rules of reasoning. On the other hand, however, it may be seen as being constructed through the effects of the doing of intersectionality – how the

students' subject positions are shaped through negotiations in the intermingling of social categories in specific situations. Students' interactions will thus be studied through how the categories emerge in the lived lives of students – through, on one hand, the translocal system of reason providing particular dispositional ways to tell the truth (which social categories are provided e.g. in connection to the desired future flexibility), and, on other hand, as the various ways students take up different dispositions and turn them into their own (how these categories are embodied or performed through the negotiations in the processes of the intermingling of social categories). Connecting those two perspectives means viewing subjects as positions, where potential opportunities for acting are regulated by categorization and disposition through translocal systems of reason in the particular transnational context of schooling. The space is consisting of educational practices with intersections of ties that can be ascribed to at least two nation-states (like Denmark and China in the case of SDC). In this perspective, the schooling in transnational spaces is understood as global assemblages where the limits of the cosmopolitan citizenry can be traced.

The research questions asked through this framework will thus also be different than in the comparative method and go beyond the focus on dichotomies associated with Western and Eastern educational culture. For the comparative method the research questions would go something like: How can the students' learning strategies or behaviors in the transnational context be understood qua the national education culture/tradition they come from? In this framework, however, the analytical strategy is to explore subjectivity construction in education in transnational spaces by asking research questions such as: Which practices of categorization and negotiation through which translocal governmentality functions are fashioned in the lived life of schooling in a transnational space? How do students take up the different dispositions and social categories which are provided and turn them into their own in the process of becoming a desirable cosmopolitan citizen of the future? In the theoretical framework suggested in this chapter, the eye of investigation can thus be specified through the politics of (self-)knowledge in schooling in a transnational context where certain kinds of subject positions become possible for students through translocal governmentalities.

References

Bereday, G. Z. F. (1964). *Comparative method in education*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Biggs, J. (1996). Western misperceptions of the Confucian-heritage learning culture. In D. Watkins & J. B. Biggs (Eds.), *The Chinese learner: cultural, psychological, and contextual influences* (pp. 45–67). Hong Kong: CERC.

Brah, A. (1996). *Cartographies of diaspora, contesting identities*. London: Routledge.

Butler, J. (1999). *Gender trouble. Feminism and the subversion of identity* ([Reprint.]). New York: Routledge.

Chan, C. (2010). Classroom Innovation for the Chinese Learner: Transcending Dichotomies and Transforming Pedagogy. In C. K. K. Chan & N. Rao (Eds.), *Revisiting the Chinese Learner* (Vol. 25, pp. 169–210). Springer Netherlands.

Chan, S. (1999). The Chinese learner – a question of style. *Education + Training*, *41*(6/7), 294–305.

Clark, R., & Gieve, S. N. (2006). On the Discursive Construction of "The Chinese Learner." *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *19*(1), 54–73.

Coverdale-Jones, T. (2006). Afterword: The Chinese Learner in Perspective. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *19*(1), 148–153.

Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, *43*, 1241–1299.

Dale, R. (2003). Globalization: a new world for comparative education? In J. Schriewer (Ed.), *Discourse formation in comparative education* (pp. 87–109). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Davies, B. (2000). *(In)scribing Body/Landscape Relations*. Oxford: AltaMira Press.

Davies, B., & Harré, R. (1990). Positioning : The Discursive Production of Selves. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, *20*, 43–6.

Faist, T., Fauser, M., & Reisenauer, E. (2013). *Transnational migration*. Cambridge, UK Malden, MA: Polity Press.

Foucault, M. (1980). Two Lectures. In C. Gordon (Ed.), *Power/knowledge – selected interviews and other writings 1972-1977 – Michel Foucault*. Chicago:

Chicago University Press.

Foucault, M. (2002a). Governmentality. In J. D. Faubion (Ed.), *Power - Essential works of Foucault 1984-1989 - volume 3*. Penguin Books.

Foucault, M. (2002b). The subject and power. In J. D. Faubion (Ed.), *Power - Essential works of Foucault 1984-1989 - volume 3*. London: Penguin Books.

Foucault, M. (2008). *The archaeology of knowledge*. Routledge Classics.

Green, A., Preston, J., & Janmaat, J. G. (2006). *Education, equality and social cohesion: A comparative analysis*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gu, Q., & Schweisfurth, M. (2006). Who Adapts? Beyond Cultural Models of "the" Chinese Learner. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *19*(1), 74–89.

He, L. (2016). Transnational Higher Education Institutions in China: A Comparison of Policy Orientation and Reality. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *20*(1), 79–95.

Heater, D. (2002). *World citizenship, cosmopolitan thinking and its opponents*. London: Continuum.

Hu, G. (2002). Potential Cultural Resistance to Pedagogical Imports: The Case of Communicative Language Teaching in China. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *15*(2), 93–105.

Jin, L., & Cortazzi, M. (2006). Changing Practices in Chinese Cultures of Learning. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *19*(1), 5–20.

Li, J. H. (2016). Students' strategies for position-taking in transnational education. *Praktiske Grunde: Nordisk Tidsskrift for Kultur- og Samfundsvidenskab*, *3–4*, 53–72.

Lutz, H. (2014). Intersectionality's (brilliant) career? How to understand the attraction of the concept? *Working Paper Series*, *1*(1). Retrieved from http://www.fb03.uni-frankfurt.de/51634119/Lutz_WP.pdf

Ministry of Education in China (2016a). The list of approved postgraduate level transnational higher education programs and institutions. Retrieved from http://www.crs.jsj.edu.cn/index.php/default/approval/orglists/1

Ministry of Education in China. (2016b). The list of approved undergraduate level transnational higher education programs and institutions. Retrieved from

http://www.crs.jsj.edu.cn/index.php/ default/approval/orglists/2

Mok, K. H. (2012). The Rise of Transnational Higher Education in Asia: Student Mobility and Studying Experiences in Singapore and Malaysia. *Higher Education Policy*, *25*(2), 225–241.

Ong, A. (1999). *Flexible citizenship: The cultural logics of transnationality*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.

Ong, A. (2005). (Re)Articulations of citizenship. *Political Science and Politics*, *38*(4), 697–699.

Ong, A. (2006a). Experiments with freedom: Milieus of the human. *American Literary History*, *18*, 229–244.

Ong, A. (2006b). Mutations in Citizenship. *Theory, Culture & Society*, *23*, 499–505.

Ong, A., & Collier, S. J. (2005). *Global assemblages: technology, politics, and ethics as anthropological problems*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Plum, M. (2010). *Dokumenteret faglighed: Analyser af hvordan pædagogisk faglighed produceres gennem læreplanernes dokumentationsteknologi. [Documented professionalism: Analyses of how "professionalism" is produced through the technology of educational plans]*. University of Copenhagen.

Popkewitz, T. S. (1998). *Struggling for the soul: The politics of schooling and the construction of the teacher*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Popkewitz, T. S. (2000a). Globalization/Regionalization, Knowledge, and the Educational Practices: Some Notes on Comparative Strategies for Educational Research. In *Educational Knowledge – changing Relationships between the State, Civil Society, and the Educational Community* (pp. 3–27). Albany, N.Y.: SUNY Press.

Popkewitz, T. S. (2000b). Rethinking Decentralization and the State/Civil Society Distinctions: the State as a Problematic of governing. In *Educational Knowledge – changing Relationships between the State, Civil Society, and the Educational Community* (pp. 173–199). Albany, N.Y.: SUNY Press.

Popkewitz, T. S. (2001). *Cultural history and education: Critical essays on knowledge and schooling*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

Popkewitz, T. S. (2007). *Cosmopolitanism and the age of school reform: Science, education, and making society by making the child*. London: Routledge.

Popkewitz, T. S., & Brennan, M. (1998). *Foucault's challenge: Discourse, knowledge, and power in education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Rastall, P. (2006). Introduction: The Chinese Learner in Higher Education – Transition and Quality Issues. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *19*(1), 1–4.

Razack, S. H. (1998). *Looking white people in the eye: Gender, race, and culture in courtrooms and classrooms*. Toronto Buffalo: University of Toronto Press.

Saravanamuthu, K., & Yap, C. (2014). Pedagogy to empower Chinese Learners to adapt to western learning circumstances: A longitudinal case-study. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, *44*(3), 361–384.

Singh, M., & Sproats, E. (2005). Constructing Local/Global Pedagogies: Insights into The Learning Experiences of International Students. *Education and Society*, *23*, (19), 43–61.

Staunæs, D. (2003). Where have all the subjects gone? Bringing together the concepts of intersectionality and subjectification. *NORA - Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research*, *11*(February 2015), 101–110.

Staunæs, D. (2004). *Køn, etnicitet og skoleliv. [Etnicity, gender and school lives]*. Frederiksberg: Forlaget Samfundslitteratur.

Staunæs, D. (2005). From culturally avantgarde to sexually promiscuous: Troubling subjectivities and intersection in the social transition form childhood into youth. *Feminism & Psychology*, *15*(2), 151–169.

Søndergaard, D. M. (1996). *Tegnet på kroppen. Køn: Koder og konstruktioner blandt unge voksne i akademia [The sign on the body. Gender: Codes and constructions among young adults in Academia]*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum.

Vertovec, S. (2002). *Conceiving cosmopolitanism: Theory, context and practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Watkins, D. (2008). Western educational research – a basis for educational reforms in Asia. In A. Tan, O. S., McInerney, D. M., Liem, A. D. & Tan (Ed.), *What the West can learn from the East: Asian perspectives on the psychology of*

learning and motivation (pp. 59–76). Charlotte, N.C.: Information Age Publishing.

Yan, F. (2010). Tensions within the Changing Chinese Higher Education System and Learning. *Frontiers of Education in China*, *5*(4), 473–476.

PAPER 2

Li, J. H. (2018). Transformations of Chinese and Danish students' perceptions of the significance of culture in transnational education in China. In F. Dervin, X. Du, & A. Härkönen (Eds.), *International Students in China: Education, Student Life and Intercultural Encounters*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Transformations of Chinese and Danish students' perceptions of the significance of culture in transnational education in China

Jin Hui Li

Abstract

Using a case of Sino-Danish cooperation in higher education, this chapter's aim is to illuminate how higher education has moved from being merely a national matter to transnational cooperation and how this kind of cooperation is educating citizenry to comply with the political ideas of current global challenges. Through a historical contextualization of the role of higher education in state-building in China and Denmark the chapter illustrates that these countries have similar yet different ways of embedding their state-building efforts in their universities. The effects of the merging of these efforts in the educational practices of the Sino-Danish Center for Education and Research (SDC) are explored through interviews with students about their experiences of the new educational space. The analysis shows that the SDC is a dynamic space, where students' identities and values are governed by the shift in perceptions of diversity in their behaviors, from national culture to national scientific culture.

Keywords: Transnational university education, global future, cultural encounters, global citizenry, transnational curriculum

Introduction

During the last three decades, the political interest of Western universities and nation-states in transnational higher education projects in the Asian region has increased significantly (Chen, 2015). Asia is the region with the strongest involvement in transnational higher education, and China is viewed as the most promising market for importing education (Caruana, 2016). In China, transnational higher education cooperation has been growing rapidly since the government allowed the establishment of transnational higher education programs in the mid-1980s (Chen, 2015). A new era was inaugurated in 1995, as the Chinese government now permits collaborative ventures, known as transnational education institutions (He, 2016). The Nordic countries have created new collaborative ventures and programs with China. In 2016, several higher education institutions in Sweden, Norway, Finland and Denmark operated jointly with Chinese universities to provide undergraduate and graduate programs in China. Also two jointly led university centers have been established as collaboration between Chinese universities and universities from Finland and Denmark (Ministry of Education in China, 2016a; 2016b). This chapter focuses on the case of Denmark and a newly opened university center in Beijing: the Sino-Danish Center for Education and Research (SDC),[1] where students and faculty are primarily Danes and Chinese. The SDC's *raison d'être* can be viewed as a set of ideas linked to the need to strengthen the nation-state through transnational education collaboration: the university promotes itself and is promoted by the Danish Ministry for Science, Innovation and Higher Education

[1] The SDC is a partnership between all eight Danish universities and the Chinese Academy of Sciences, located in Beijing, where the students take their courses. The SDC offers seven master's programs; two in Social Science, four in the Natural Sciences and one in Engineering. The enrolled students are from either China or Denmark (with a few students being from another European Union country, enrolled through the Danish side). The language of instruction at the SDC is English.

as *a form of education in innovative solutions to global challenges* for the nation-states of Denmark and China (www.sinodanishcenter.com).

Before discussing whether and how this kind of education can address global challenges, we have to raise a fundamental question about institutions like the SDC as an educational institution: How are student subjectivities shaped through the ways cultural meaning is transformed and created in the establishment of educational practices, given that the institutions' context is composed of students and faculty with different national education experiences and practices? Regarding subjectivity, this paper relies on a Foucauldian concept of the subject as one possible position among others, dynamic and negotiable, instead of a static and essential entity (Foucault, 2002; 2008). Subjectivity is understood as differentiated possibilities for subject positions and identities (Buchardt, 2014); it is the individual's self-knowledge and identities, and thus the possibility for action and participation (Popkewitz, 2000). The concept will be expanded later in the chapter.

Contextualization of the role of the university in China and Denmark is needed before focusing on the shaping of student subjectivity in new institutions like the SDC to grasp how these nation-states address state-building challenges through higher education. I will illuminate the historical and current function of higher education in (ongoing) nation-state building. The purpose of this article is to discuss how higher education has moved from being merely a national matter toward transcending the boundaries, thus becoming transnational cooperation, forming citizenry in order to comply with the political ideas of global challenges. I will first compare the historical and current role of higher education in the two nation-states in question, namely China and Denmark. Second, I will explore how Danish and Chinese student subjectivities are shaped through the ways cultural meaning is transformed and created by focusing on how students struggle to achieve acknowledgement in such a transnational education program.

The degrees of change in the students' perceptions of the significance of culture bound to nationality in education will be elucidated. The students' narratives about their educational achievement at the SDC and their interactions with each other are guided by their descriptions of their changing perceptions of nationalized cultural diversity in education. I will present a theoretical framework for discussing the subjectivities formed in transnational educational practice and the methods before I analyze the students' narratives.

The historical relationship between the nation-state and higher education

The relation between higher education and the state in the nation-state building process in China and Denmark has differed in many ways, and yet the role of the university in both cases has been important in the formation of citizenry. In the Nordic countries, the close links that became formative for the university and nation-building grew as the need for education and expert training in several fields of society increased with the emergence of nation-states and the rise of bureaucratic governance. For the Nordic countries in the 20th century, universities gained significance by training civil servants and other experts on the needs of constructing the welfare state (Buchardt, Markkola, & Valtonen, 2013). The knowledge that experts acquired through education ensured them a role in building the welfare state as they became social engineers of the nation at all levels. The educational institutions are thus seen as part of the formation of the welfare policy (Antikainen, 2006; Telhaug, Mediås, & Aasen, 2006). In Valtonen's examination of the role of educators as professionals in the Finnish welfare state from the 1860s to the 1960s, she argues that the new educational institutions were not merely created to fulfill the requirements of educational policies by educating educators and "laypeople;" the new experts also won much societal influence and responsibility in civil society through shaping the new welfare policies (Valtonen, 2013). In the Nordic countries, the State

expanded its role in education and welfare in general. In the case of Denmark, Hansen (2015) argues that the welfare state was a project based on scientific knowledge. The scientific knowledge applied by the social engineers in building the new institutions in the welfare state was gained from new university institutions and disciplines established in the 1960s and 1970s. Social engineers were also interested in creating a new cohesion in the whole society. Thus, education programs were developed to handle the needs of the gradually emerging welfare state and modern welfare expertise.

For the "modern" Chinese state (after the People's Republic of China was founded in 1949), the significance of higher education in building the nation-state is not as unambiguous as for the Nordic countries. However, as Hayhoe (2012) states, Chinese universities have always had a close interactive relation with the state. This arises from the strong tradition of civil service examinations and scholars' social responsibility. However, in a historical comparison of the role of the university in Canada and China for creating civil society, Hayboe points out that Chinese universities had obtained limited autonomy and participated in China's modern development after 1949, as academic freedom was seen as a threat to Chinese socialism (Hayhoe, 1992). She offers a more distinct interpretation of (the Western concept of) autonomy and academic freedom in later work (2012) in which she suggests a redefinition of Western interpretations of the terms "academic freedom" and "autonomy" in a Chinese context. The term for autonomy in Chinese is "self-mastery" rather than "self-governance," referring to legal or political independence. Similarly, the notion of academic freedom must be revised. She argues that Chinese scholars have a broader notion of the term. It differs from the academic freedom of the medieval European university that was articulated in debates over theoretical issues in particular disciplinary fields. Zha (2012) emphasizes that the notion embraces action, as well as theory, but also points to an intellectual authority closely affiliated with structures of state power. One of Zha's findings in his study of

policy processes in contemporary China is that scholars play a significant role, as individuals and through major state-funded research projects. This insight points to the persistence of a pattern long rooted in Chinese society of 'establishment scholars' offering their expertise in direct service to the state, paralleling the role of scholar officials in 'traditional' China. Hayhoe (2012) argues that Chinese universities have achieved a growing measure of autonomy in some areas, such as student enrollment, curricular development, research, international partnerships, mergers and property development after the 1998 Higher Education Law, the first law since 1949, was promulgated. However, certain political constraints are still clearly evident. They are linked to the role of the Communist Party Committee in each university, as the role of the chairman of council and the President who is responsible for all major academic decisions is almost always operated by the Party secretary.

The comparison of the historical role of the university in the Nordic countries and China shows that in both cases the university has been important in forming the citizenry. Popkewitz argues that in modern state-building education is about governing subjectivities to form desirable citizenry (Popkewitz, 2000). In the Nordic countries, scholars (e.g. Antikainen, 2006; Telhaug et al., 2006) draw upon a very significant bond between nation-state building and the need for (welfare) experts to cater to the needs of a growing bureaucracy. Scholars (Hayhoe, 2012; Zha, 2012) investigating the relationship between Chinese universities and the state do not directly attach to the relation a discussion concerning nation-state building. However, a discussion exists about the role of the university in society, such as the university as a player in cultural identity-shaping, the role of intellectuals participating in policy-making and the university as an institution contributing to the formation of civil society. Thus, in China the university was educating "elite" scholars who could offer expertise to the state and—since the economic reforms (the late 1970s)—training skilled workers to enable economic development (Chan, Ngok, & Phillips, 2008).

Trends in higher education in China and in Denmark since the 1990s

Since the latest expansion (from the mid-1990s to the present) in higher education in China and Denmark, the trends have a high level of similarity in terms of globalization and marketization, although at varied scales. Mok (2012) argues that the field of higher education in China has been affected by the growing influence of privatization and marketization, particularly as the State has reduced its role in providing and funding education. Mok (2005) notes that the latest university mergers in the field were effectuated to improve citizens' "global competence" and make the higher education system more efficient economically and academically. However, the investigations of the social consequences of privatization have shown the expansion of educational inequality, as university fees and tuition have increased so much that higher education is no longer affordable for low- and even middle-income families. Recent higher education policies suggest that the State intends to return to a more central role in order to tackle the issues of the growing social equality gap developed by the excessive privatization and marketization of social services in the last few decades, although questions about how the government will accomplish this remain unanswered (Mok, 2012).

The global focus has been maintained in Chinese universities since the mid-1980s when transnational higher education programs were allowed. In addition, in recent years the government has restated its pledge to the goal of bringing Chinese higher education up to international standards by allowing the establishment of jointly run universities such as the SDC (Mok, 2012).

Parallel tendencies can be observed in Denmark, as current higher education policies are presented as a globalization strategy that emphasizes educating citizens with a "global outlook" as a way to prepare them for the imagined global economic competition (Danish Government, 2006; 2013). In the strategy, internationalization appears to be unwavering faith in higher education, and no one

seems to be against it. The launch of the Danish government's strategy for internationalization of higher education (Danish Government, 2013) did not generate much debate or many reactions from the public or education professionals. The current policies were analyzed by Andersen and Jacobsen (2012) as a paradigm shift, in which Danish universities have changed from being "free" and independent research and education institutions to becoming competitive international enterprises that obtain their main goal and legitimacy from the economic growth they generate in society. The shift of the universities from autonomous and "free" to dependent can be questioned as not entirely new, as the internal regulation reforms in university (e.g. in light of the demand for student participation on study boards) and the expansion of the disciplines in the 1960s had already put the university's autonomy in creating the curricula under pressure (Hansen, 2015). However, academic freedom understood as the university's liberty to choose research subjects remained intact during these reforms (Hansen, 2015). Thus, it would be more precise to reframe Andersen and Jacobsen's argument about the paradigm shift in autonomy as the autonomy of research now under pressure to dissolve. However, the transformation of universities into more competitive international enterprises (owned by the state) is currently very noticeable as these were not expressed in regulation policies for universities in previous decades. Competitiveness has become a driving force in the internationalization of higher education. Thus, higher education and research have been reoriented from being discipline-based to market-driven by policies motivated by the ideology of global markets (Langberg & Schmidt, 2010).

How do two nation-states embedding their state-building efforts in their universities in similar yet different ways merge educational practices in institutions such as the SDC? What consequences will this merger have for the universities' role in state-building? Will the practices in institutions like the SDC be under pressure to be determined by the current ideology of a global market, where the main rationalities are to prepare students with imagined

global competencies in the nation-states' fight for economic survival? The overall question is under which social circumstances the type of expertise that will be offered to the state is formed if—and only if—the university continues to be involved in state-building. These questions, raised through the historical contextualization of the role of the university in state-building, will be discussed in the analysis of how students experience the educational practices of institutions such as the SDC, where the educational practices are understood as the merging of the efforts of two nation-states' state-building through education.

Conceptualizing the new emerging transnational educational space

SDC can be conceptualized as a new and emerging *transnational educational space*, where national ideas of education are being transformed as the education programs at the SDC are no longer controlled by only one nation-state institution. Faist, Fauser, and Reisenauer (2013) argue that the transnational space consists of new connections, and combinations can be made across national borders. Along with the emergence of transnational space, the relation between civil society and the state has changed, as the solid ties that used to connect civil society with the state are detached and redirected to cross national boundaries and create a global public sphere. New transnational universities like the SDC can be viewed as a transnational space of what Ong and Collier (2005) term "global assemblages," as these situations can be assumed to be ever-changing and not attached to the terrain of a nation-state.

Nevertheless, Burawoy (2000) emphasizes that the role of the nation-state has not been completely retracted, as the connections and flows are not autonomous but fashioned by a strong, attractive field of nation-states. Although nation-state performances continue, they now take place in a transnational arena with other performers where the plays/productions of the co-performances are new and yet

unknown. Elucidating this process of the performances, Ong (1999) describes it as the idea of transnationalism as it refers to the "cultural specificities of the global process, tracing the multiplicity of the uses and the conceptions of culture" (p. 4). Ong argues that new modalities in these global assemblages are emerging. She calls them *translocal governmentality* (Ong, 1999). The translocal governmentality in the global assemblages is viewed as "ideas and techniques for acting on the self and for reforming/reengineering the self in order to confront globalized insecurities and challenges" (Ong & Collier, 2005). These cultural specificities of the global process can thus be located through the political, economic and cultural rationalities that create (education) migration, relocation, business networks and state capital relations in all the transnational processes that are conceived through and governed by cultural meanings. Searching for the cultural specificities through the effects of translocal governmentalities in schooling is, in Popkewitz's sense, a search for how 'reason' and 'the reasonable person' are produced, as power operates through the circulation of knowledge, which is tied to political rationalities of the governing structures of our individuality (Popkewitz 2000). The Foucauldian notion of power is refined in Popkewitz's approach to the study of schooling. To Popkewitz (2000), the notion of power "looks to the effects of knowledge in governing social practices, subjectivities, and possibilities" (p. 16). Power is located in the way social practices, subjectivities and possibilities are governed by the interactions and circulation of different instances of knowledge. In this, the concept of the subject becomes dynamic and negotiable, instead of a stable and essential entity, as one potential position among others (Foucault, 2002; 2008).

The educational space is thus seen as a socio-academic environment in which curriculum understood as different instances of knowledge is chosen and organized as an educational object in forming the subjectivities of future citizens as schooling is about governing subjectivities to create the desired citizenry

(Popkewitz, 2000). Popkewitz argues that the 'educated subject' in the modern world is also one that is subjugated by the political rationalities to govern the self (Popkewitz, 2000). Thus, through analyzing the ways in which schooling as governing practices produces truth (rules of reason) about the world, we are able to map how our relationship with the world and 'our' selves is constructed.

Leaving the dichotomy between East and West behind

Engaging in the study of subjectivity processes that occur in a transnational learning context goes beyond previous studies of subjectivity conceptualized within the boundaries of the nation-state (including Dale, 2003; Yan, 2010). The present study seeks to add new aspects to the research field inspired by the situated approach (e.g. Clark & Gieve, 2006). The approach does not look for differences and similarities between students based on an essentializing concept of nationality but rather seeks to understand how their meetings with different educational practices disturb and moderate the students' values and identities. To understand the complexities in the curricular requirements that occur in this new context, one must examine the education processes in the institutional setting instead of the "traditional" comparisons of differences in national state systems and cultures of education based on dichotomies (e.g. studies such as Bereday, 1964; Green, Preston, & Janmaat, 2006). In other words, this study seeks to move the focus from explanations of transnational issues that preserve the dichotomy between West and East (as in Biggs, 1996; Singh & Sproats, 2005; Tan, McInerney, & Liem, 2008) to seeing the transnational learning context as a space that provides different possibilities for subject positions among the students on a micro-level.

In this perspective, the SDC's educational space forms subjectivities by allowing novel socio-academic negotiations between students and educators and between the students themselves through different instances of knowledge of

cultural diversity (Staunæs, 2004). At the same time, the SDC becomes a space constituted by varied governance practices, as the negotiations express different possibilities of subjectivities—produced in the social process (Popkewitz, 2000). By way of this theoretical framework, then, the analytical question becomes the following: How does the SDC as governing practices produce and articulate truth about the world and thus the relationship between students' selves and the world, through the disruptions and moderations of students' values and identities in their meeting with different educational practices?

Thus, concrete analysis of the empirical materials, the strategy for analyzing the data, is guided by the following questions: What transformations of values and identities do students experience in their meeting with different educational practices when they strive for recognition at the SDC? In other words, how are reason and the reasonable student produced through the transformations? Which social categories become significant in the transformations of the students' personal and collective developments? How do negotiations of the contents ascribed to certain social categories take place?

Method

This analysis is based on qualitative interviews with 15 students[2] from Denmark and China. The interviews were conducted in Beijing (summer 2013) and in Copenhagen (summer 2014) and in the language preferred by the students. The Danish students preferred Danish. Most Chinese students preferred Mandarin, but two students (Lei and Ning) wanted to speak English for the sake of practice. At the time the students were completing their first or second year at the SDC. The interviews lasted between 30 minutes and 1 hour. The students' study

[2] To protect the anonymity of the informants, I have used pseudonyms.

experiences at the SDC were the primary focus of the open interviews. This interview type explores the multi-faceted and often contrasting enunciations of experiences and frames of orientation and interpretation. The interview is seen as a kind of social meeting and conversation between the interviewer and the informant. The goal is to create narratives about the informant's reality and the means by which she or he assigns significance to it. However, the power relation between the interviewer and the informant is asymmetric, as the theme for the conversation is prearranged by the interviewer. During the conversation, the interviewer also points at the themes to be followed and elaborated (Kvale, 2006). The interviews provided insights into how specific subject positions and identities are constructed in the SDC master's programs, as the storyline of a narrative is part of the construction, and as the narratives contain suggestions of subject positions, plots and imaginations of the normal and abnormal that one can pick up and make one's own (Staunæs, 2004). I interviewed three of the students twice, in their first and second year, as I was lucky that they agreed to talk to me one year later when they were doing their thesis work. These students were Ning, Lei and Eline. I use their experiences to foreground the analytical ideas. The way the empirical material has been analyzed is through readings of the interview transcripts led by concrete analytical questions stated in the above section. The first step of the analysis has focus on what students seem to have in common in their experiences. The second step is exploring how the students articulate these experiences differently and connect them to different social categories in which they explain their own transformations of values and identities. The examples in the following analysis show the variety of the students' experiences.

Decoding a new educational culture

The students' negotiations of their subject positions are depicted through student narratives about how their interactions at the SDC are led by their changing

perceptions of nationalized culture diversity. “Prejudices” and “differences” connected to having a certain national and academic background were brought up by all the students in the interviews, whether the students talked about their experiences in the SDC learning environment in general, teamwork-based project assignments or after-class social activities. The students believe that their initial perceptions of differences between students with different national and academic backgrounds changed over time. The change in perspective leaned toward a more differentiated understanding of culture, social interactions and study skills in relation to nationality. The students take a retrospective approach to the subject, using terms such as “in the beginning” and “now after one year” or “after a while,” creating a timeline that underscores how their ideas have developed.

Like many of the students I interviewed, Anna from Denmark does not frame the classroom as either Danish or Chinese but as something new. For example, she says that people are moving away from being competition-minded to being more into solidarity, as they encourage each other to speak up and deliver arguments in the lectures as a way to help each other. This idea of the SDC as a hybrid institution and a different university frames how the students conceptualize the context of their education and the challenges of studying in an environment with profound national and academic diversity. They point out the emergence of a new educational culture through this hybridity, differing from the educational setting they are used to. The formation of the new educational culture develops concurrently with the students changing their ways of thinking and acting. The students see themselves in a process of enlightenment through being part of the new and hybrid culture. The need to change their understandings of cultural behavior bound to nationality in the context of transnational education is, in the students’ experiences, connected to how the teamwork assignments function. The students emphasize the decreasing difficulties of working across nationalities in teamwork by contrasting the present with the beginning. Lei

from China pointed out that in the beginning the study challenges contained many misunderstandings and prejudices because of the language barriers, as the Chinese students' English was not sufficient and the students assumed that they could continue with their old study habits in the new setting. The challenges the students experienced with communication between nationalities forced them to find novel strategies. In Lei's and Anna's experiences, we can capture a description of the need to learn a new system and a way of decoding the new "culture," as the SDC context is a place where "the old national skills" of communicating and working together no longer function optimally.

The students' study and communication skills from their national education experiences seem to be under dissolution, while a new culture for how to say things, how to discuss things in order to be (ac)knowledgeable, arises. Therefore, the techniques for reengineering the self in order to confront globalized challenges in this transnational academic context are to readjust beliefs in the significance of a nationalized cultural behavior, by which student behavior from respective countries can be explained. This seems to be the SDC's curricular requirements. The need to develop new strategies for communication and ways to form a common understanding in group work and during the lectures was described by second-year students as stabilized into a familiar everyday routine. What was necessary to create the stable and familiar everyday routine and how and which common understandings of the needed skills are created to decode this new form of curriculum will be explored in the following section.

Creating a common understanding of the needed skills

Although the interaction challenges in the SDC classroom were connected to the perceived academic and national background differences, the students are more willing to and engaged in talking about the critical moments that created the

needed common understanding in relation to the nationality categories than academic diversity. In the following examples from the student narratives about situations defined as "the turning point" or "the critical moment" for the interactions in their group work and in the classroom, the ways that common understandings are shaped become obvious. The examples demonstrate understandings regarding reasonable and recognizable skills in this educational institution and how the understandings are connected to certain embodied nationalities at stake. Thus, it is possible to illuminate the necessary ways of reasoning in the curricular requirements of the SDC and the ways these requirements are linked to certain embodied nationalities. The different degrees of tension in the struggles among the students to reach consensus can be viewed as three exemplary processes.

The first example features Ning, a student from China. She explains that the first year at the SDC taught her a different way to practice education than what she had expected. Her narrative displays a 'peaceful' transformation in the 'natural' process of becoming a reasonable SDC student:

> Ning: At least for me in my undergraduate school, if the teacher said something or wrote something on the blackboard that I thought was not correct, I'd go to her or him after the class, and then if there was something wrong with a formula, he'd say, oh yes. And then at SDC, in our class, the Danish guys'll raise their hand, and say, oh there's something wrong in the formula, and they'll point it out directly then. After this time at SDC, I now think that I'll point it out directly. In the very beginning, I'd think that it'd be embarrassing, but what I think now is that it's okay. I think that, okay, what *you* think is maybe different from the professors or other

> students. (Ning, first-year student in the Water and Environment program, from China)

In Ning's comparison of current and prior requirements, she finds that the ability to be direct (and have your own opinion) and non-hierarchal thinking of positioning are demanded in a SDC classroom. Further, she asserts that she has been acquiring these skills as the year progressed. She perceives it to be a positive dimension of the SDC which is derived from the way the Danish students act in the SDC classroom. Ning interprets these skills as attached to a specific Danish education practice, as the Danish students perform it naturally. Although the abilities are attached to the imagined Danish-ness, they do not seem to be fixed and available only to the Danish students in the SDC classroom. The abilities are also available to Chinese students who are willing to adapt to obtain scientific knowledge. In Ning's narratives of her development toward becoming a more recognized student by performing the valued skills of the SDC, the national categories are very strong. In that way, Ning experiences that her own resources from her Chinese education are not acknowledged as useful.

The second example plays out in Eline's narrative about the group work process, where settling for social order requires challenging struggles. Eline from Denmark describes her experiences of working with students with varying national backgrounds as SDC challenges to overcome.

> Eline: Last time we were doing a project, I was together with two Chinese by myself, and when we came to the discussion part, where one could clearly feel that they wanted facts on the table, I was more, like, that we have to discuss what is good and bad, what we have to change, but in that sense, it seemed to me that they learn and adapt quickly. When we first begin to discuss, or rather try to explain that it's necessary to discuss it this way, we pose these questions: What if something happened, what can

> one do? Then they are also able to get started and try to discuss, but they are not naturally like this: That we have to discuss or come up with a critical opinion. (Eline, first-year student in the Water and Environment program, from Denmark, my translation from Danish)

This quotation illustrates a situation in which the group is forming and making agreements about how the work should be done, which procedure their process should follow. Here, Eline sees herself as having the ability to discuss, an important skill in the group project assignment. In group work with Chinese students, she interpreted the ability to discuss as unnatural to Chinese students but natural to Danish students. The turning point for forming the basis of the cooperation in the team was when Eline explained the need for discussion during group work. She finds herself persuading the group to integrate the discussion culture, which she describes as a successful process of their work with the assignment. In the narrative, a distinct dichotomy is created between them and us, based on national study skills (e.g. the ability to discuss). Eline thinks that this ability along with critical thinking are features of Danish education, but she also thinks that Chinese students can adopt them quickly. The students are pictured as flexible and able to pick up abilities that are imagined as tied to a certain nationality that is not 'their own.' The category of nationality functions dynamically in the student interactions.

However, as the third example featuring the student Niels illustrates, some interactions across the nationalities took place under a very tense atmosphere. Niels' narrative is about a process the students have undergone in their discussions about criticizing national policies. According to Niels, the turning point for creating a common understanding of the importance of using critique in the learning context and for the learning output was the meta-discussion they had half a year after they started at the SDC. Before the meta-debate he had some controversies with Chinese students, as the critique he raised against

Chinese policies in Niels' view was perceived by Chinese students as a personal attack on China that the Chinese students felt they had to defend.

> JHL: We talked about a critical culture or critical discussion culture before, you said you had a 'meta-talk' about it, how did it work after that?
>
> Niels: I think in the beginning, we didn't have so much of a meta-talk. We kind of had the expectation that the Danes will raise their hands in class and discuss with the teachers, and the Chinese won't say anything. This was raised as a point during class in plenum. However, nothing was done about why we had the approaches that we had. It is important to have a discussion like that in the beginning of the process, to enable them to understand why we are doing this in this way. We didn't have that discussion in the beginning, but later on, because they were a bit surprised that we kept criticizing Chinese policies. And along the way, they became better at engaging in the discussions but still not as good as the Danish students. I think that discussing with and explaining to them, and maybe provoking them a bit and telling them that these are ours (methods, ed.), and we think that it is important because it is something which promotes dialogue about some of the things, and that is exactly in my point of view the intersection where different opinions meet, where you become challenged on your own opinions. And against that background, you maybe will get another view of things and society. (Niels, second-year student in the Public Management and Social Development Program, from Denmark, my translation from Danish)

This illustration depicts how consensus was reached during sensitive negotiations which required provocation and conviction. As a result of the struggles, critical thinking practices are staged as the basis of gaining scientific knowledge regardless of nationality. In Niels' narrative, the Danish students were already educated in that way, whereas the Chinese students had to catch up,

which they seem to do gradually after the meta-discussion. The sensitivity of the discussions of national policies among the students illustrates that the "critical sense" is articulated not only as a practical skill or an instrumental tool for studying but also as a skill for personal development. Personal development is seen as the way one's personal opinion becomes challenged through the discussion made possible by "critical sense." "Critical sense" here is produced as a national marker, with Danish-ness encoded in it. The acquisition of scientific knowledge involving national policies at the SDC seems to demand a detachment from assumed (Chinese) nationality. However, at the same time, the acquisition of scientific knowledge is constructed as a Danish method for solving social issues in civil society, in which Chinese students will have to catch up. In a sense, the SDC curricular requirements denationalize scientific knowledge and, at the same time, nationalize it. This requires Chinese students (only) to dispense with their assumed national pride and participate in critiques of Chinese and Danish policies in order to obtain a degree from the SDC.

Discussion

The analysis shows some of the same tendencies as the studies based on the essentializing concept of "Chinese learners" (Grimshaw, 2007) in the perceptions of Chinese students. The term "Chinese learners" is applied to problematize the group of Asian international students with roots in a Chinese-speaking country at English-speaking universities as these students exhibit "Chinese behaviors in [a] Western classroom," which is seen as a clash between the pedagogy of Western universities and the Chinese tradition of learning. The group is often constructed as being obedient to authority, passive in class, lacking in critical thinking and inadequate in adopting learning strategies (Saravanamuthu & Yap, 2014; Tan et al., 2008). However, at the SDC, the educational space is dynamic, and the subject positions for the student are not fixed by nationality or language. Instead, they are flexible, and Chinese students

are not seen as lacking the ability to adopt new learning strategies. However, although the SDC curriculum attempts to denationalize the requirements, it nationalizes them in other ways, as the curriculum requirements are linked to the imagined Danish scientific practices rather than Chinese ones. Therefore, Danish students are one step ahead in becoming more reasonable students. In that sense, a non-intentional competition occurs among students as they are equipped with a certain knowledgeable body marked by their nationality. Therefore, at the SDC some of the perceptions of education practices divided into West and East categories are also reproduced. The shift in the governing principle of the students' subjectivity is one of the consequences of the merging of the two nation-states' similar yet different ways of embedding state-building in their universities. The governing principle of students' subjectivity is led by the shifted focus on interpreting diversity in behavior through national scientific culture instead of national culture. This may imply that the main rationalities from higher education policies at the SDC as a global assemblage are concretely translated into a struggle about hierarchization of forms of scientific knowledge bound to different nation-states. Hence the main rationalities from higher education policies as a central part of nation-states' fight for economic survival become a struggle about becoming the most scientific nation-state. The described hierarchization can be seen as an expression of how competition between the nation-states is taking place through the transnational educational practices. In that way, the site of the SDC becomes a site for a competition to nationalize scientific knowledge and practices. Thus, the role of the university in state-building continues in institutions such as the SDC. The intention of constructing the SDC as an institution that can produce a workforce and citizens with a global outlook and competencies seems to be translated and practiced at the SDC as ways to invest certain national students with the strongest argumentation of what scientific knowledge is with implicit connotations of national imaginaries. Thus, the expertise offered to the state formed under these circumstances will also carry the identity marker of nationalized scientific

knowledge. Through the translocal governmentality at the SDC, the students can be viewed as future citizens not only fighting for their own personal acknowledgement and development but also struggling with representing a national interest in these processes of nationalizing the educational and scientific practices.

Concluding remarks

In analyzing the process of the critical moments of students' socio-academic developments, I identified various struggles in transnational education, which visibly illuminate how the students' educational practices in this transnational context change as perceptions of the significance of nationalized culture in education are modified. These examples offer a pattern of the ways the students are making reason in their performance of transnational education. By locating the rationalities in transnational education practices, the analysis has, in Ong's (1999) sense, dealt with the cultural specificities of the global process. The examples do not represent one individual's whole educational process; nevertheless, they illuminate political rationalities tied to the governing principles of their individuality linked to the certainty of Danish-ness as among the ways power is exercised and produced in the transnational context of the SDC. Popkewitz (2000) argues that national schooling is about constructing "the national imaginaries that give cohesion to the idea of the national citizenry." In addition, this analysis displays some aspects of what transnational schooling is constructing. The transnational subjectivities are shaped by the ideal of the student at the SDC as scientific and non-national, while in the social process the negotiations express possible subject positions that are produced differently depending on the nationality that marks the bodies of the students. The possible subject positions produced through the transnational educational practices at the SDC are therefore still nationalized, as being more or less scientific is strongly attached to national categories. Therefore, transnational schooling is also

producing a cohesion that will reinforce the idea of national citizenry. Exploring the transnational processes at the SDC illustrates that the establishment of institutions destabilizes the bond in some ways by having an ideology of an achievement of scientific knowledge that is stated as non-national. However, it may not be breaking the strong historical bond between nation-state building and educational regimes, as student negotiations for acknowledgement are still attached—and their professional identities are still renewed in relation—to an imagined nationality.

References

Andersen, H. L., & Jacobsen. (2012). *Uddannelseskvalitet i en globaliseret verden. Vidensøkonomiens indtog i de videregående uddannelser [Education quality in a globalized world: The entry of knowledge economy in higher education]*. Frederiksberg: Samfundslitteratur.

Antikainen, A. (2006). In Search of the Nordic Model in Education. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 50*(3), 229–243.

Bereday, G. Z. F. (1964). *Comparative method in education*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Biggs, J. (1996). Western misperceptions of the Confucian-heritage learning culture. In D. Watkins & J. B. Biggs (Eds.), *The Chinese learner: cultural, psychological, and contextual influences* (pp. 45–67). Hong Kong: CERC.

Buchardt, M. (2014). *Pedagogized Muslimness: Religion and Culture as Identity Politics in the Classroom*. Münster/New York: Waxmann Verlag GmbH.

Buchardt, M., Markkola, P., & Valtonen, H. (2013). Education and the making of the Nordic welfare states: Introduction. In M. Buchardt, P. Markkola, & H. Valtonen (Eds.), *Education, state and citizenship* (pp. 7–30). Helsinki: Nordic Centre of Excellence NordWel.

Burawoy, M. (2000). Introduction: Reaching for the Global. In M. Burawoy, J. A. Blum, S. George, Z. Gille, T. Gowan, L. Haney, & S. H. Lopez (Eds.), *Global Ethnography: Forces, Connections and Imaginations in a Postmodern World* (pp. 1–41). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Caruana, V. (2016). Researching the Transnational Higher Education Policy Landscape: Exploring Network Power and Dissensus in a Globalising System. *London Review of Education, 14*(1), 56–59.

Chan, C. K., Ngok, K. L., & Phillips, D. (2008). *Social policy in China: development and well-being*. Bristol, U.K.: Policy Press.

Chen, P.-Y. (2015). Transnational Education: Trend, Modes of Practices and Development. *International Journal of Information and Education*

Technology, 5(8), 634–637.

Clark, R., & Gieve, S. N. (2006). On the Discursive Construction of "The Chinese Learner." *Language, Culture and Curriculum, 19*(1), 54–73.

Dale, R. (2003). Globalization: a new world for comparative education? In J. Schriewer (Ed.), *Discourse formation in comparative education* (pp. 87–109). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Danish Government. (2006). *Progress, Innovation and Cohesion. Strategy for Denmark in Global Economy*. Retrieved from http://www.stm.dk/multimedia/PROGRESS_INNOVATION_AND_COHESION.pdf.

Danish Government. (2013). *Enhanced insight through global outlook – more students studying abroad, stronger international learning environments and better foreign language skills.* Retrieved from http://ufm.dk/en/publications/2013/files-2013/enhanced-insight-through-global-outlook.pdf.

Faist, T., Fauser, M., & Reisenauer, E. (2013). *Transnational migration*. Cambridge, UK Malden, MA: Polity Press.

Foucault, M. (2002). The subject and power. In J. D. Faubion (Ed.), *Power - Essential works of Foucault 1984-1989 - volume 3* (pp. 326–348). London: Penguin Books.

Foucault, M. (2008). *The archaeology of knowledge*. London/New York, Routledge Classics.

Green, A., Preston, J., & Janmaat, J. G. (2006). *Education, equality and social cohesion, a comparative analysis*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Grimshaw, T. (2007). Problematizing the construct of "the Chinese learner": insights from ethnographic research. *Educational Studies*, *33*(3), 299–311.

Hansen, E. (2015). Universiteter og idealer i velfærdsstaten [Universities and ideals in the welfare state]. In E. Hansen, J. E. Larsen, C. Larsen, B. R. Larsen, & L. R. Rasmussen (Eds.), *Uddannelseshistorie* (pp. 76–91). Selskabet for Skole- og Uddannelseshistorie.

Hayhoe, R. (1992). Universities, Cultural Identity, and Democracy. Some Canada-China Comparisons. *Interchange*, *23*(1), 165–180.

Hayhoe, R. (2012). Introduction and Acknowledgements. In R. Hayhoe, J. Li, J. Lin, & Q. Zha (Eds.), *Portraits of 21st Century Chinese Universities: In the Move to Mass Higher Education* (Vol. 30, pp. 1–18). Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands.

He, L. (2016). Transnational Higher Education Institutions in China: A Comparison of Policy Orientation and Reality. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *20*(1), 79–95.

Kvale, S. (2006). Dominance through interviews and dialogues. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *12*(3), 480–500.

Langberg, K., & Schmidt, E. K. (2010). Local Diversity and Identity Versus Global Interaction: Changes in the Danish Higher Education System. *European Education*, *42*(1), 37–60.

Ministry of Education in China. (2016a). The list of approved postgraduate level transnational higher education programs and institutions. Retrieved from http://www.crs.jsj.edu.cn/index.php/default/approval/orglists/1.

Ministry of Education in China. (2016b). The list of approved undergraduate level transnational higher education programs and institutions. Retrieved from http://www.crs.jsj.edu.cn/index.php/ default/approval/orglists/2.

Mok, K. H. (2005). Globalization and educational restructuring: University merging and changing governance in China. *Higher Education*, *50*, 57–88.

Mok, K. H. (2012). Bringing the State Back. In: restoring the role of the State in Chinese higher education. *European Journal of Education*, *47*(2), 228–241.

Ong, A. (1999). *Flexible citizenship: The cultural logics of transnationality*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.

Ong, A., & Collier, S. J. (2005). *Global assemblages: technology, politics, and ethics as anthropological problems*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Popkewitz, T. S. (2000). Globalization/Regionalization, Knowledge, and the Educational Practices: Some Notes on Comparative Strategies for

Educational Research. In *Educational Knowledge – changing Relationships between the State, Civil Society, and the Educational Community* (pp. 3–27). State University of New York Press.

Saravanamuthu, K., & Yap, C. (2014). Pedagogy to empower Chinese Learners to adapt to western learning circumstances: A longitudinal case-study. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, *44*(3), 361–384.

Singh, M., & Sproats, E. (2005). Constructing Local/Global Pedagogies: Insights into The Learning Experiences of International Students. *Education and Society*, *23*(19), 43–61.

Staunæs, D. (2004). *Køn, etnicitet og skoleliv. [Etnicity, gender and school lives]*. Fredriksberg: Forlaget Samfundslitteratur.

Tan, O. S., McInerney, D. M., & Liem, G. A. D. (2008). *What the West can learn from the East – Asian Perspectives on the Psychology of Learning and Motivation*. *Research in multicultural education and international perspectives*. Information Age Pub.

Telhaug, A. O., Mediås, A. O., & Aasen, P. (2006). The Nordic Model in Education: Education as part of the political system in the last 50 years. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, *50*(3), 245–283.

Valtonen, H. (2013). How did popular educators transform into experts of the Finnish welfare state from the 1860's to the 1960's? In M. Buchardt, P. Markkola, & H. Valtonen (Eds.), *Education, stat and citizenship* (pp. 160–185). Helsinki: Nordic Centre of Excellence NordWel.

Yan, F. (2010). Tensions within the Changing Chinese Higher Education System and Learning. *Frontiers of Education in China*. Front. Educ. China.

Zha, Q. (2012). Understanding China's Move to Mass Higher Education from a Policy Perspective (Vol. 30, pp. 20–57). Springer Netherlands.

PAPER 3

Li, J. H. (2018). How am I supposed to feel? Female students' emotional reasoning about academic becoming in a transnational higher educational context. To be submitted to *Gender & Education*.

This paper is not included in the official printed version due the process of submission to a journal.

PAPER 4

Li, J. H. (2018). Construction of place-identities and future aspirations for the citizenry in transnational higher education. To be submitted to *Globalisation, Societies and Education*.

This paper is not included in the official printed version due the process of submission to a journal.

PAPER 5

Li, J. H., & Chen, J. (2018). What is worth knowing about and from ‘the others’ through studying abroad? A comparative analysis of internationalization of higher education policies as part of nation-state formation in Denmark and China. To be submitted to *Studies in Higher Education*.

This paper is not included in the official printed version due the process of submission to a journal.

ISSN (online): 2246-123X
ISBN (online): 978-87-7210-229-0

AALBORG UNIVERSITY PRESS